NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 07994737 4

375.2

# SABBATISMOS.

A

# DISCUSSION AND DEFENCE

OF

# THE LORD'S DAY OF SACRED REST.

BY

GEORGE JUNKIN, D.D. LL.D.

PHILADELPHIA:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,
BY JAMES B. RODGERS, No. 52 & 54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.
1866.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year of our Lord, 1866, by

GEORGE JUNKIN,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY WESTCOTT & THOMSON.

# TO THE READER.

THE American people are a Christian nation; and, like all other nations, having any reasonable pretensions to civilization, they have had from the first an *organic law*. Without an organic law, or constitution, they would not be a nation, in any other sense than that in which we call our Indian tribes nations. Our first political organic law, which made us a nation was the Declaration of '76. This soon yielded to the ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION; and this again to the CONSTITUTION, our present organic law. The first two are defunct as to their form: they are no formal part of our Constitution, whilst their moral substance is perpetuated in the grand bond of our NATIONAL UNION. But above and beyond all these, the people who made this nation always recognized the moral law of God as summarily contained in the TEN COMMANDMENTS, and as spread out in "the Scriptures of Truth," as the grand basis of our entire national organization. Our Common Law is all found, as to its pure moral elements, in the Bible. Among these pure moral elements stands conspicuous the FOURTH COMMANDMENT. Strike down this, and our Christianity goes with it. Destroy the Lord's Day, and its indispensable accompaniments, and you sweep away the foundations of the

Republic. For a free government without the representative principle is an impossibility. Without the virtue which the Sabbath only can secure and promote, a democratic republic, of any considerable extent, never existed and never can. Hence the frequent assaults upon the Sabbath. Six years ago all classes of irreligion, deism, atheism, etc., conspired to overturn our Sabbath laws. Now another attack is in progress, with this avowed purpose.

Penn's Great Law—the first ever established in his Province, was passed December 12, 1682, see Chap. xiv. of this work; its principle was renewed in 1700, in 1705, in 1794, in 1845, and is now the law which this combination of hostile interests is endeavouring to destroy. Hence this little work.

I have arranged the matter for practical use: yet not going into much detail as to minor objections; giving *principles* rather, which the reader must apply in refutation of objections.

# CONTENTS.


## CHAPTER I.

PAGE

HISTORICAL PROOF OF THE MORAL CHARACTER OF THE SABBATH.

1. First law ever given to man—2. Worship in Adam's family—3. Noah observes a seven days' section of time—4. Seven, a number of perfection—5. The law renewed at Sin—Bondage in Egypt..... 9

## CHAPTER II.

OBJECTION ANSWERED.

If the Sabbath had been given at the beginning, it must have been often named in history..... 16

## CHAPTER III.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS A COMPEND OF MORAL LAW

Law necessary to man at the beginning—1. Their history—2. Covenant with God—3. Miraculous accompaniments—4. Given by Messiah—5. Moses' miraculous fast—6. Written on stone—7. Deposited in the Ark..... 25

## CHAPTER IV.

A SACRED REST PROVED BY NATURAL RELIGION AND PROFANE HISTORY..... 34

## CHAPTER V.

PAGE

THE TEN WORDS—RIGHT OF THE FOURTH BY PRESCRIPTION ..... 39

## CHAPTER VI.

ARGUMENT FOR THE SABBATH FROM THE CHARACTER OF ITS OPPOSERS.

The fruits prove the tree good or bad ..... 45

## CHAPTER VII.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF ISRAEL—THIS CONSTITUTION PURELY RELIGIOUS AND MORAL.

Ratification—"The commandments" mean the ten—Adopted not by tribes, but as a nation—Examination of the ten words—The fourth passed by ..... 52

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF ISRAEL PURELY MORAL —CONTINUED—FOURTH COMMANDMENT ANALYZED ..... 62

## CHAPTER IX.

ALL JEWISH PECULIARITIES ARE LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS, NOT CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS.

Some constitution necessary—Distinction between law and penalty—1. The passover—2. The tabernacle—3. Servants—4. Usury laws—5. Penalties vary, law unchangeable—Death penalty to six of the commandments ..... 69

## CHAPTER X.

SET FEASTS, OR EXTRA SABBATHS.

Col. ii. 16, vindicated, against our opponents—New moons —Passover—Trumpets—Atonement day—Tabernacles —Rom. xv. 5, 6 ..... 79

## CHAPTER XI.

PAGE

THE FOURTH PRECEPT, OBJECTION TO BECAUSE ITS PENALTY IS TOO SEVERE—LOCAL LEGISLATION UNDER IT FOR HEBREWS.

Death penalty, as in the other eight..... 86

## CHAPTER XII.

OBJECTION—THE SABBATH WAS A SIGN TO ISRAEL, THEREFORE NOT A PERMANENT MORAL LAW.

Things well known are used as signs—Sun, moon, and stars—Rainbow, circumcision, stars and stripes..... 95

## CHAPTER XIII.

OBJECTIONS—IF YOU HOLD TO THE SABBATH, YOU MUST HOLD 1. TO ITS DEATH PENALTY—2. TO THE SEVENTH DAY.

Seventh day, never used as a name for the day of sacred rest—Sabbath day is never used but as the name of time devoted to sacred rest..... 101

## CHAPTER XIV.

THE QUESTIONS OF TIME.

Evasion by it attempted—Remarks—1. The same absolute portion impossible—2. Day begins? extra Sabbaths at even—3. The seventh, or the first day? a voyage round the globe changes the day—4. The change of day to the first—Sunday a name objectionable—William Penn on Lord's day..... 108

## CHAPTER XV.

BENEFITS OF THE SABBATH.

Individual man—Physically, socially, intellectually, spiritually—Eternally—Upon society..... 127

## CHAPTER XVI.

PAGE

THE MORAL FORCE OF THE SABBATH—AND ITS BEARING ON NATIONAL WEALTH..... 133

## CHAPTER XVII.

KEEP IT HOLY TO THE LORD

Negatively—Positively..... 142

## CHAPTER XVIII.

DUTY OF HEADS OF FAMILIES AND NATIONS—PLEA OF FOREIGNERS—LET US ALONE.

Relations—1. To son and daughter—2. To his man-servant and maid-servant—3. Nor thy cattle—4. And thy stranger that is within thy gates..... 152

## CHAPTER XIX.

OBJECTION—THE SUNDAY LAWS OF THE STATE CURTAIL CIVIL LIBERTY.

German combination—Laws are a restraint—Every precept of the ten restrains—Not bondage but freedom..... 161

## CHAPTER XX.

THE SABBATH—A TYPE OF HEAVEN..... 169

# THE LORD'S DAY A SACRED REST.

## CHAPTER I.

### HISTORICAL PROOF OF THE MORAL CHARACTER OF THE SABBATH LAW.

1. The first law ever given to man —2. Worship in Adam's family — 3. Noah observes a seven-days' section of time —4. Seven, a number of perfection —5. The law renewed at Sin —Bondage in Egypt.

THE Bible is our book of moral philosophy. Above and beyond it there is no authority. What then does it say as to the Sabbath?

1. The first proof of its permanent moral obligation is the fact that it is the first law God ever enacted "for man." "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that on it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."—Genesis ii. 3. What can be meant by this blessing the day? Can *time* be made happy? What by hallowing or making it holy? Can *time* be clothed with moral purity? Clearly, both the blessing and the sanctifying have reference to man, for whom our Saviour says the day was made. This appointment of a day of rest for man, immediately

after creation, proves that it was not an institution peculiar to the Jewish nation, for Abraham, their root-progenitor, was not born until 2076 years afterwards; and because it is expressly said elsewhere, "The Sabbath was made for man"—for mankind; and because here, the reason of its appointment was God's ceasing from the work of creating, in which the whole race are equally interested. It was established as a means of holiness and happiness to mankind. This proves it to be a moral law binding and blessing all the human race.

2. The second proof we find in the history in Genesis iv. Here we have a brief account of public worship. "At the end of days"—at the cutting off of days. Here is reference to the division of days into sections. The number of days included in these sections is not here named. But as afterwards we know the sections were of seven days, as will be proved shortly, we have a right to conclude it was so here. The history of his creation most assuredly was made known to Adam. It is not conceivable that God would give him no account of the creation of the six days and the resting of the seventh. To allege, because no written account was given to Adam, therefore he was ignorant of all this, is simply childish; for no man can prove that there was any written alphabetic language prior to Moses. And why should Moses be informed of the history of creation and Adam himself left ignorant of it? No man can believe it. Be-

sides, the brevity of the history admits not of detail in this worship of Adam's family—the whole race. These first seven chapters cover the history of 1656 years. This public worship, in process of time—at the end of days—imitating the Creator's example of six days' labor and one of rest, is mentioned as a thing of course, and proves the observance of a day of sacred resting from labour and of holy consecration.

3. The cutting off of days into sections of seven days is twice mentioned in Genesis viii. 10, 12. This proves that Noah observed the division of time, the same as we do now. The same can be inferred from the seven days noted in chapter vii. 4, 10, "Yet seven days and I will cause it to rain." "And after seven days the waters of the flood were upon the earth." Undoubtedly the hebdomadal division of time was then currently in use.

4. The application of this number to the clean beasts, v. 2, also shows a mystical use, most easily explained by its reference to the days of creation and of rest as its origin. Seven is the number of perfection. The seventh year was consecrated, and "seven Sabbaths shall be complete," and previously, the Egyptian visions presented "seven well-favoured kine," and ill-favoured the same in number; and so seven good and seven bad ears on a stock. So seven days and seven priests, bearing seven trumpets, etc., plainly showing the number seven to be peculiarly distinguished in the Scriptures; and

this being first presented in reference to the days of sacred rest, amounts to more than a violent presumption—it constitutes a proof of the seventh day's consecration as a Sabbath from the beginning.

5. The next historical notice of the law is in Exodus xvi. 1:—"The children of Israel came unto the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai." This was before the giving of the law at Sinai; for we learn in Numbers xxxiii. that there were four removals of the camp, viz., Dophkah, Alush, Rephidim, and Sinai, before they came to the Mount. It was here in the wilderness of Sin, they murmured for bread and the manna was given. Just one month passed from their departure from Rameses (see Numbers xxxiii. 3,) on the 15th day of the first month, and on the 15th day of the second month they came into the wilderness of Sin (Exodus xvi. 1.) And, "in the third month, when the children of Israel had gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day they came unto the wilderness of Sinai." Exodus xix. 1. The same day, that is, the fifteenth day. At the very least, therefore, the rain of manna took place a month before the thunders of Sinai were heard. Of this bread from heaven, the people gathered an homer for each person each day, except on the sixth day they gathered two homers for each person. The rulers reported this matter to Moses, "And he said unto them, this is that which the Lord hath said,

to-morrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord; bake *that* which ye will bake *to-day*, and seethe that ye will seethe." Exodus xvi. 23, 26, "And Moses said, Eat that to-day, for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." On this remark—

(1.) In their bondage condition for two hundred and ten years, it is not conceivable that the people could enjoy their Sabbath rest, and keep up the regular system of worship and instruction which belongs properly to "the Sabbath which was made for man;" those sweet rests and joyous songs of praise, and heavenly instructions by their elders (for they had elders even in Egypt. Exodus iii. 16. "Go and gather the elders of Israel together;" and xii. 21; and xvii. 5, etc.) The oppression which doomed all their male children to death, like the oppression, which dooms a man to work in a printing-office, or on a railroad car seventeen hours per day, for seven days in a week, must have well nigh crushed out all knowledge of the holy day, as it cut off the poor people from all opportunity to worship their God and to receive instruction from their elders.

(2.) This miracle of the manna is manifestly designed, as it is admirably adapted, to teach the people the blessedness of the Sabbath day. It teaches (1,) That they have a *right*, a franchise from the

God of heaven, to cease from labour one day in seven. No Egyptian task-master (no printer or rail-road company) may stand over them to enforce labour on the Sabbath. No dire necessity any longer to toil all day at the brick-kiln, the printing-office, or the cars. Total abstinence from toil is required. "Bake that which ye will bake to-day." Evidently the Hebrew in the wilderness was a freer man than the bakers are to-day in Philadelphia. Freedom from labour, and liberty to worship God unmolested, have made so little progress in 3757 years! Such is the despotism of Mammon! (2,) That the people are not to sit in idleness, or run wild in excess of plays and sports. "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." "Abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." They kept the day "*holy* unto the LORD." The only sense, as we have seen, in which *time* can be kept holy, is the performance of holy exercises of God's worship. "It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day."

(3.) This transaction, as a whole, is not the enactment of a new statute, but the resuscitation of an old one. Our statute-book exhibits an analogous case. The act of Penn, December 12, 1682, just after his first landing in his colony, (see Chap. 14) states, "for the ease of the creation, every first day of the week, called the Lord's Day, people shall abstain from their common toil and labour." This

"GREAT LAW" was not set aside, but involved—re-enacted in the law of 1705. The act of 1705 was called up and re-enacted in 1794, and again in 1845. If we had only the *lex non scripta*, the cases would have been more alike. They are, however, alike in another respect, viz., some appendages are added, as we shall see in another place. Now, we insist that this has not the form and appearance of a new law. "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." If a colporteur take his station near some depot, where the crowd is hurrying off to worship God in the country, and should raise his voice and say, "This is the Sabbath to be kept holy unto the Lord, and here are little books suitable for the Lord's day," would he be considered in the light of a legislator enacting a new statute? Thus our Lord himself speaks:—"A new commandment give I unto you, That ye love one another:" but John, 1 Epis. ii. 7, speaking of the very same law of love, says:—"I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning." Here is no inconsistency:—"He that loveth not his brother, abideth in death."

(4.) We must remember this transaction occurred a whole month before this same Sabbatic law, but with more detail, was enacted again at Sinai. So our legislature act continually. A large amount of their acts contain, and are an enactment of some principle of the Decalogue.

## CHAPTER II.

### OBJECTION ANSWERED.

If the Sabbath had been given at the beginning, it must have been often named in history.

HERE we may as well meet an objection. It may be—it has been said, if the Sabbath was a binding moral law from the beginning of mankind, as Luther and Calvin tell us, it is strange that we find scarcely any notice of its observance for so many hundred years. Surely, if it had been a moral law, binding upon all mankind, more frequent notices of it must have occurred during the twenty-five centuries from Adam to Moses. This is plausible, but not solid. For, first, as just noted, the history is very brief; and we have seen two notable instances of Sabbatic observance. Secondly. The patriarchs Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were in the habit of erecting their altars and of calling upon the name of the Lord. See Genesis viii. 20, xii. 7, xxii. 9, xxxv. 1–3. Now calling on the name of the Lord is a description of public worship; and public worship implies publication of the time and place—it involves conventional agreement; and the presump-

tion is strong that these days of public worship were the same as observed from the beginning—the hallowed Sabbath day. But my third and chief refutation of this objection lies in the fact that it is a negation. There is no record duly authoritative that Moses' wife was a black woman; therefore she was not black, she was only "an Ethiopian woman." There is no record that Abram forded the Euphrates; therefore he did not ford that river. There is no evidence that he ferried over it; therefore he did not cross it at all. Let us apply this reasoning in another case. From the days of Cain (Gen. iv. 17) to the flood, there is but one mention made of wives (Gen. iv. 19;) therefore men had no wives for sixteen centuries. From the sacrifices of Abel and Cain to Noah, no sacrifices are mentioned in the records, and so from Noah to Abraham; therefore the divine institution of sacrifice was utterly neglected for sixteen centuries, and again for four centuries. Again, "No special instance of the practice of circumcision is recorded as having occurred from the settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan to the time of Christ." (Princeton Rev., October, 1859.) Therefore for nearly fifteen centuries the sacred symbol and seal of Abraham's covenant was lost and ignored! On the contrary, the brief notices above of the law of sacred rest are just such as the brief history would reasonably be expected to give.

Let us expand this last idea a little. It is argued by the opponents of the Lord's Day, that if the rest

was given to man at the beginning as a binding moral law, it would surely have been oftener mentioned in history; whereas we hear nothing of it until Moses gave it at Sinai; it is therefore a Jewish institution, and we have nothing to do with it. This is the logic of a distinguished divine of the Established church of Scotland, and quite fresh. Of course my readers know, that the cream of Scotland's piety and learning was skimmed off from the church established by law to constitute "the Free Church." Establishments seemed doomed to a descending movement: it is exceedingly probable that this argument will develop the Colenso of the Scottish establishment. But let us to the answer. If the omission or infrequent mention of the Sabbath from Adam to Moses proves that it was never given to man as a moral law, this must be equally applicable to each and every one of the ten commands. They were all alike uttered in thunder from Sinai; all equally written and rewritten by the finger of God on the tables of stone; they each and all stand on the very same foundation; they must stand, all of them, or fall together. If the Glasgow Colenso has demolished the fourth commandment, he has overthrown the Decalogue; he has annihilated the whole moral law of God, and there will be a jubilee in Sodom, Gomorrah, and Pandemonium. Now, dear reader, would you believe it? This conclusion the Glasgow Doctor swallows. "The whole of the Decalogue as a Decalogue was buried with Jesus in his

grave." This results, by the necessity of eternal logic, from the position taken, that the fourth commandment is purely Jewish. But the end is not yet; for the same inexorable logic will force him to reject the whole Old Testament, *a fortiori;* and yet further, the New Testament must fall too.

Open infidelity is the end of this assault upon the moral law of the Sabbath. Short of this no logical mind can stop. This accounts for the glaring fact, that all the interests of immorality—the rum holes, the gambling-houses, the theatres, the masked balls, "the synagogue of the libertines," the pulpits which "deny the Lord," and proclaim an amnesty in the world of woe—all conspire to overthrow the Sabbath; whilst all evangelical Christians, of all names and denominations, "stand up for Jesus," and advocate the observance of the Lord's Day.

If any of the other precepts are found in the same condition with the fourth, as to not being mentioned from Adam to Moses at Sinai, the same conclusion must inevitably be deduced against it. Silence in the record condemns the fourth; why not condemn every precept in reference to which the same silence is observed? From this there is no shift: it must be met. Let us then see how the case stands. The first command is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Will any pleader against the fourth point out to us the chapter and verse, from Adam to Moses, wherein this first precept is found? If no man can be discovered so learned in the law,

then indisputably, the first command is null and void."

How is it with the second? "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, etc." Worshipping idols, or using them at all in worship, is forbidden. Will Dr. McLeod show us the record of this precept, prior to Moses? Therefore the second commandment is obliterated; away with this Jewish figment, and give liberty to the human soul, that the "free German," and the scoffing atheist, and the bigoted Romanist, may bow down and kiss the toe of Jew Peter, expel God from his own world, and rescue civil government from the thraldom of moral law, and all fear of justice, and love to the Creator!

The third command is:—"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," etc. Is this recorded anywhere in the history prior to Moses? Let the place be pointed out. Where is it? If not, then these gentlemen have their conclusion. The law against profane swearing and blasphemy is not binding upon us. How dare any man reprove us for it? "Our tongue is our own; who is lord over us?" How dare you ask a free man to swear in a court of justice, and yet punish him for taking God's name in vain on any occasion he pleases?

The same fate awaits the fifth and sixth precepts —"Honour thy father and thy mother, etc.," "Thou shall not kill." If these are not recorded in the history, they are Jewish rites, with which we have

no concern; and what child does not know that no such record exists? Hence, my readers, the fearful disregard of parental authority. With all the restraint of law and the force of instruction under these precepts, how fearful the disregard to parents, and how horribly murders abound! Take away these laws, let corrupt nature know there is no moral law giving authority to parents or protection to life by the punishment of crimes; and where are we? What a state of society we shall have!

We touched on the law of the seventh command on a former occasion. "From the days of Cain" (Gen. iv. 17) to the flood there is but twice mention made of wives (Gen. iv. 19), therefore men had no wives for sixteen centuries. Concubines, and others still less permanently bound to any man, must have been the mothers of all, from Lamech to the flood. Brigham and his harem are not new inventions, if this logic be based on a true premise. Let us embrace this philosophy in our moral code, and the Mormon gospel will supplant the Bible, and Christian ladies may attend balls without wearing masks.

We have good authority for the existence of the seventh precept from the creation. "Have ye not read, that he, which made them at the beginning, made them male and female?" Math. xix. Moses extended some indulgence, but he never allowed the putting away of a wife for every cause, but only for impurity. See Deut. xxiv. 1. The Pharisee belied Moses, who did not sanction divorce without cause;

but if a man find a woman impure, and is about to send her off, Moses orders him to "give her a bill of divorce." This whole thing was, however, a municipal regulation of the Jews, and not the seventh precept—not the law of marriage prescribed from the beginning to the whole race. Indisputably, to those who believe the Bible, marriage is a moral law, and was made at the beginning, and this, monogamy, and not polygamy. Monogamy is the original law, and the seventh precept enforces it. But no mention is made of it from Paradise to Sinai, in the brief history; therefore, according to the argumentation which we are refuting, the seventh is not a moral law, but only a Jewish ceremonial affair, and nothing to us at all.

"Thou shalt not steal." This eighth precept cannot be found on the record until you come to the history of Joseph, who charged his brethren with stealing his silver cup; it therefore cannot be a moral law according to the reasoning used to annihilate the Sabbath, by converting it into a Jewish ceremony. From all these obviously false conclusions we infer the falsehood of the principle from which they spring, and return with increased confidence to the correctness of the doctrine, that "the Sabbath was made for man," immediately upon his creation.

We have seen the general character of this declaration of our Lord; but there remains an aspect of it not yet presented. If it was ordained and estab-

lished for the benefit of mankind it must have been communicated to man, and not kept hidden for twenty-five centuries, and then revealed and made known to three millions of fugitives from bondage, who, by their very social constitution, were not to be a commercial people; but whose national system cooped them up and secluded them from mingling among the nations. If there was no day of sacred rest appointed of God for the benefit of mankind until Israel reached Sinai in the year of the world two thousand five hundred, how could it be said this day was made for man?

Man knew nothing at all of it for near half the present age of the world! But if you take the history as it is, and find God blessing the Sabbath day and sanctifying it, setting it apart from the six days' labour, and requiring man to cultivate thereon his mind and heart in the worship of the great Creator, and promoting charity among one another; and consider the deep depravity and sinfulness of man, which leads him away from God; and therefore the constant tendency to disregard the holy day—then you see the beautiful consistency of the language, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," with all the historical facts of the case.

The vocation of Abraham, and the setting apart of his race as the peculiar people of God, was precisely designed to secure the truth from becoming entirely unknown and lost. So the writing of the history of the world's creation, and of man upon

the earth, became a necessity, when the lives of men dwindled down so rapidly after the flood; and in order to preserve these oracles, they were entrusted to this chosen and segregated people, that the ages to come might not wholly lose the knowledge of their own history. We are now ready to approach the holy and awful Mount, whence this Divine memorial of the original rest-day issued forth from the midst of the fire.

## CHAPTER III.

### THE TEN COMMANDMENTS—A COMPEND OF MORAL LAW.

Law necessary to man at the beginning.—1. Their history.—2. Covenant with God.—3. Miraculous accompaniments.—4. Given by Messiah direct.—5. Moses' miraculous fast.—6. Written on stone.—7. Deposited in the Ark.

If an engineer were to construct a locomotive of a million horse power, fire it up, and start it in the midst of our city, without governor or guide, to run at random through streets and through houses, carrying desolation and death in its fearful course, would the public account him a wise and good citizen? Or would they hold him for a madman or a fiend, and call him to account for his conduct? If some Van Amburgh should turn adrift an untamed elephant or a ferocious lion upon the community, without any governing power to control him, would he be esteemed a wise and a good man? And do you believe that God built such a machine and sent it thus adrift? Did he let loose upon his world such an elephant, or such a lion, and yet make no provision for its government, rule, and direction? Why, my reader, the wise Creator enacted laws for

the government of every creature of his hand. Dead matter has its laws; and living animals are governed by instincts created in them, and with them. And can you believe that man, the crowning work of creation, and the mightiest for good or evil of all the inhabiters of earth, was thrown into the world without law or governing principle in him? Or do you not rather believe that law—moral law—was con-created in him and with him: that he was created in the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness: that this image of God involved the *moral sense* or *conscience;* in short, that man was made a moral agent and held accountable for his conduct? If so, he must have had a law given to him as the rule of his action. You cannot form a conception of a moral agent which does not involve the idea of a *moral law*—that is, a rule prescribing duty. Hence the generally received doctrine concerning the moral law of man's creation, that God made man upright and gave him a rule of action. To this Paul refers in Romans ii. 15:—"Which show the work of the law, written in their heart, their conscience also bearing witness." To deny a primitive revelation to man of an elementary law for a rule of action, is to deny his moral agency and to place him below the brutes and birds, whose instincts are to them effective laws. Such is not the characteristic of him who is lord of all this lower creation.

Now, this primitive revelation, so absolutely ne-

cessary to man's moral agency, was common to the race; and that it has been often disregarded by individuals is no more proof of its non-existence in the earlier ages, than the running of printing-presses and cars on Sunday is proof that Pennsylvania has never had a law against such things. The first recorded of these primitive laws, as we have seen, is that prescribing the appropriation of one day in seven to rest from labour *physical*, and to active labour in things *spiritual*. But that there were other moral rules for man in the various relations of society, cannot be doubted. No law against murder is named in the record, but the death of Abel and the treatment of his murderer, in whose favour a pardon, or rather a *noli prosequi* was issued, shows that such a law was well known at that day.

We now enter on the proof of the proposition, that the law of the Ten Commandments is a summary re-enactment of the moral laws under which God had placed man.

1. Let us advert to their history. One month after the revival and restoration of the Sabbatic law, Israel arrived at Sinai; Moses, the vicegerent of God, their King, went up the very next day to meet God on the Mount. Exodus xix. 3. God remanded him back to the people, to submit to them the terms of a covenant which he proposed to establish between himself and Israel. Its terms are —"If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure to me

above all people—for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests; and a holy nation." Verses 5, 6. Moses went down "and called the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words." And all the people (that is, by their representatives, the elders) answered together, and said, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." Verses 7, 8. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord. This negotiation occupied two days, and Moses was directed to go down and make all proper arrangements for the awful solemnities of the third day. Bounds are to be marked along the base of the Mount, over which no man or beast must pass. Verses 12, 13. The morning of the third day from their arrival was ushered in by the loud discharges of heaven's artillery: "Thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the Mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud, so that all the people that were in the camp trembled." And remember, they numbered three millions. "And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God, and they stood at the nether part of the Mount. And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole Mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the Lord came down upon

Mount Sinai, on the top of the Mount, and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the Mount, and Moses went up." Verses 16–20. Such are the scenes preparatory to the giving of the law of the Ten Commandments; the central *one* of which wicked man desires to strike out, and thus to drown the thunders of omnipotence in the mad bellowings of Mammon for money! money! money! The grandest and most sublime scene our earth ever witnessed, or ever will witness, until that very same Lord shall descend with a shout with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and wake up the teeming myriads of earth's longest and most profound sleepers, is to be scouted and contemned, because a few rebels against God's law and the laws of Pennsylvania want to make money by Sunday labour!

2. Having entered into a formal and solemn covenant with Israel, they pledging obedience to him, and he pledging to make them his peculiar treasure above all people, the Lord proceeds to test their obedience by prescribing laws to them. The great and magnificent preparations for their utterance we have adverted to. We must now note the new and more intimate relations the people sustain to God under this covenant of restrictions; which looks to the limitation of the covenant with Abraham making him the father of many nations, and confining its blessings to this people of Israel. Accordingly, in verse 2, chap. xx. he refers to this peculiar nearness of relation, "I am the Lord thy God, which

have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." This language is substantially the same which prefaced the proposal of the covenant of restriction mentioned in the preceding paper, and in chap. xix., 4–10. Without expressly affirming it, it nevertheless suggests the reason why Israel should give an attentive ear to the commandments immediately following. It occupies the local position, yet without either the form or the substance of a preamble to the constitution which follows. Hence it is argued by some that the ten words belong exclusively to the Hebrew people, and that they have no binding authority for any other people. We admit they express a reason, special and pointed, and based on gratitude, why that people should make a solemn league and covenant with God, and why they should fulfil it in keeping this law of the ten words. But how this should shut out other nations and people from the pale of this moral code, it is impossible for us to see. There are no terms indicative of exclusiveness, either in this preamble or in the ten words, or in the subsequent remarks; nothing to shut off the rest of mankind from the benefits of God's moral law.

We ought to note particularly that they were uttered in thunder-tones from the summit of the fiery Mount. We have observed the prelude to the awful act, and when the majestic utterances are closed, the historian tells us (verse 18,) "And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and

the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking." No difference is perceived in regard to any of the ten. All and equally they are the voice of God.

3. This miraculous utterance, with all its dread surroundings, is intended to impress the mind with a profoundly solemn sense of the transcendent importance of the matter or things so uttered. We can imagine nothing better adapted to produce such an impression. "And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was. And the Lord said unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven"—verses 21, 22. Take with this (3) another remark. These ten commandments are all that God thus spake. Much instruction and many laws he communicated through Moses; but the *ten only* in thunder tones to the whole people directly. Their very great importance it is impossible for us not to infer.

4. Before we inquire into the matter of them, let us note the person who gave this law. This we find to be the second person—the Son of God. This is made evident by comparing Psalm lxviii. 17, 18 with Ephesians iv. 8:—"The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is in the midst of them as in Sinai. Thou hast ascended on high, Thou hast led captivity captive; Thou hast received gifts for men." This is applied by Paul to

Christ:—"When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." The same Lord who was among his angels on Sinai, descended into the lower parts of the earth, and also ascended and received and gave gifts for men. Jehovah Jesus it was that thundered from Sinai and that flashed in the lightnings out of the thick darkness and the lurid flames; hence this fire was, like that in the bush at Horeb, a fire that burned without consuming.

5. Moses, after the utterance of the ten words, drew near the thick darkness, xx. 21, and there abode with God in the Mount forty days and forty nights. Exodus xxiv. 18. And during these meetings he received a great variety and number of municipal regulations, chapter xx. 21 to xxiv. 1, and the entire instructions concerning the construction of the Tabernacle. And at the close he received the "two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God,"—xxxi. 18. "And on them was written according to all the words which the Lord spoke with you in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire." Deut. ix. 10.

6. This writing on stone is as significant as the utterances from Sinai, of the permanency of the Ten Commandments, and their essentially moral nature. They are a transcript of the moral attributes of God, and as unchangeable as his own eternal nature. Nothing short of this can be inferred from the material and the writing.

7. The same is taught in their subsequent deposit in the Ark, called for this very reason "the Ark of the Testimony." The ten words are God's testimony to moral purity and against all iniquity. The Ark is the most sacred of all the Tabernacle and its furniture. Its location within the vail, the material of its composition, the golden cover and the cherubim constituting the mercy seat, and the fact that nothing but the two tables was permitted to be deposited therein — all conspire to enhance the purity, permanency, and sacredness of the ten words. The entire system of the Tabernacle service has these tables for its central idea. To keep untarnished the tables of the testimony; to impress the worshippers with the profoundest veneration and reverence for them; to point out the way of acceptable approach into the holiest of all; and to provide for the dissemination of their contents on the swift wings of the divinely constituted and qualified messengers of mercy, this is the life and soul of the symbolic gospel of the Tabernacle. See, for more on this point, "The Tabernacle," recently published at No. 821 Chestnut Street.

## CHAPTER IV.

### A SACRED REST PROVED BY NATURAL RELIGION AND PROFANE HISTORY.

THE design has been expressed, to limit the discussion to Bible arguments. "Above and beyond it there is no authority." And this design I will adhere to, with but little deviation. Nevertheless, you will indulge me, in presenting the common argument in favour of a sacred, religious and physicial rest, deduced from natural religion. A few only of the leading points of argument can be compressed into our brief space.

1. *Physical labour* is a necessity to man. Let the Deist account for the fact as he may, he cannot deny its existence: the great mass of mankind are doomed to work for their living.

2. This doom *exhausts* their physical powers: labour cannot possibly be continuous and indefinite. Rest, in its primary sense of cessation from motion, there must be, or the living, human machine will wear out and perish.

3. This *rest*, because of man's very extensive association in work in factories, work-shops, &c. must

be *simultaneous*. The operators must begin, and continue and cease at the same time.

4. Man is *social*: he must live in society. Monasticism is a sin against the laws of nature and of nature's God. No man has a right, as we have seen before, to expatriate himself from human society; for then he must perish, and suicide is a crime.

5. Man is a *religious* being. The disposition to venerate and adore some being or beings superior to himself is an essential element of his nature, come whence it may. Neither Deist nor atheist can deny this and express his denial in continuance. Witness Hume and Voltaire. Speculate they may, and persuade themselves by times into the belief in all unbelief; but nature will arouse them from the fond dream of skepticism, to a consciousness of their own rational nature and moral accountability. "The spectre conscience starting through the gloom; man! we shall meet again beyond the tomb."

6. Man is *social in religion*. The world's history is the proof. In all pagan antiquity, social religion displayed its amazing power, in the construction of temples, and the expenses of religious worship. Their principal investments of capital and wealth were in these very things.

7. *Time* is an indispensable element in social religion. Convocation must take place and duration. Whatever be the forms and substance of their religion, they must come together and remain together for some time.

8. *Place*, therefore, is as necessary as time. Without a place of social worship, and a time, the thing itself is utterly impossible. Both these elements are indispensable, for the embodiment in action, of the most powerful and predominant principle in man's nature—his religious principle.

9. *Conventional agreement*, therefore, is a necessity, to social worship. There must be a time and a place *agreed* upon; when and where the people may and shall assemble together for sacred worship.

10. The first three remarks above, are equally applicable to the *mind* as to the body; the mind must work; it becomes exhausted; it must rest that it may be refreshed and qualified for renewed action.

11. The settlement of time and place for public, social worship, by conventional agreement, involves the *cutting* up of time into *sections*. For if no day is appointed in a regular succession, convocations of the people for worship soon become impracticable. One part are working in the shop on silver shrines for Diana, whilst others are at the temple. The business of society is thus thrown into inextricable confusion: and they will be forced to fix upon a regular time for rest from labour and devotion to religion.

12. Thus we have a Sabbath by the inherent and unchangeable laws of human nature. How often it shall occur; whether one day in four, or five, or six, or seven, eight or ten, will be somewhat difficult to determine; but determined it must be; there is

no avoiding it. A day of sacred rest man must have.

Now from these elements, every one of which is historically true, we infer that, had the question been left to human experiment, it would have been found that one day in seven is best suited to all the wants of man. Long periods would have been required to settle the question by experiment. Philosophers would have wrangled about it for centuries, and there is no probability that they would have ever come to a unanimous agreement what the law of nature on this subject is. The fact, however, is, that the nearest approach to agreement is for the seventh part of the time. We assert, however, that this is the result of the primitive law or rest established in Eden, and handed down in imperfect traditions. Of these traditions Owen has quoted from Hesiod, giving both Greek and English: the latter I present to the reader. "The first, the fourth, and the seventh day is sacred."

"The seventh again, the sacred or illustrious light of the sun." And out of Homer,

"Then came the seventh day that is sacred."

Again, "It was the seventh day, wherein all things were finished, or perfected." Again,

"We left the flood of Acheron on the seventh day."

He adds also out of Linus,

"The seventh day, wherein all things were finished."

Again, "The seventh day among the best things, the seventh is the nativity of all things."

"The seventh is amongst the chiefest, and is the perfect day."

He quotes the Latin of Tibullus, a Roman writer, speaking of the "Saturni sacra die"—the holy day of Saturni—that is, Saturday: and Ovid, speaking of the Sabbath—"nec te peregrina morentur Sabbata." "Nor let foreign Sabbaths detain you."

These quotations prove simply, that in the remotest pagan antiquity, the seventh day was known as a sacred day: and those who may consult Owen's master work, will see abundant proof of the seventh being the most generally admitted day for religious observances the world over.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE TEN WORDS—RIGHT OF THE FOURTH BY PRESCRIPTION.

THE Decalogue has been, for three thousand three hundred and fifty-six years, esteemed and held, by all who knew it, as a brief compend of moral law. The sentiments of the few infidels which lie scattered along this vast tract of time, are utterly beneath contempt as argument against the ten commandments. These sacred oracles bear down all opposition by their own inherent force, from their manifest and perfect adaptation to man in all possible conditions. They are perfectly free from all specialty that can limit them to any tribe, people, or nation. In principle they are therefore common to the race, and co-eval with its existence. Now, among these Ten, and central to them, is the Fourth, which was first divulged. The Sabbath is as old as the finished creation. We have just seen its coincidence with the dictates of nature and reason. Not that it was the discovery of reason; but, when proposed to reason, secured its conviction to this amount, that it is a law of God the Creator, given for man's

benefit. It has date as a law 5866 years back. It holds the place, therefore, by right of prescription. Many laws on human statute books have become obsolete, from mere neglect, although never formally repealed. Not so this Fourth of the TEN. For although no mention of it is made in the history of Israel, for 559 years—see Num. xxviii. 10, and 2 Kings iv. 23—yet no reasonable pretence has ever been set up or can be, that it was obsolete and inoperative during nearly six centuries. Another fact, this, for those to study who allege the silence of Scripture (erroneously too, as we have seen) from Eden to the wilderness and Sinai, as proof against the Sabbath-Bereshith, or Sabbath of the beginning, so called by Maimonides, Abarbinel, Manasseh Ben Israel, and other learned Hebrew commentators, who affirm this law to be co-eval with men. With such a basis for prescriptive right, this Firstborn of commandments may well challenge contradiction—"He crouched as a lion, and as an old lion, who shall rouse him up." "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah."

The logical result is, that the burden of proof is thrown upon the assailants of the Sabbatic law. Its friends stand behind bulwarks of nearly sixty centuries standing and have nothing to fear, if only they prove faithful to their solemn trust and stand up for Jesus and his holy day. He uttered this law in thunder tones out of the midst of the smoke on the top of the burning mountain. Whose voice is this,

that seeks to drown the voice of the Son of God? He wrote these words with his own finger on the tables of stone. Who is this, that seeks to obliterate the only record ever written, immediately, by the God of heaven? Come on, gentlemen. Bring up your chisels and mallets and cut out this word from the centre of the stone. We have been some considerable time in possession, bring your ejectment and let the cause be fairly tried. Our opponents allege

1. You have admitted the TEN WORDS to be the *Federal Constitution of the Hebrew Commonwealth.* But we Americans, Britons, Frenchmen, are not citizens of the Hebrew Commonwealth; and are therefore not bound by this constitution. This inference, we admit, would be fair, logical and irrefragable, were it not for the single lapsus, that God has given to us, this same identical constitution for our government, under himself as the Governor over the nations. He had given the same substance, as the constitution of government to the nations before the flood, to the patriarchal governments from Noah to Moses: to the Assyrian, the Egyptian, the Greek, the Roman, and now to the French, the British, the American; to all the nations, for He is Lord of all. Glaringly false, therefore, is the covert assumption, in this argument, that the TEN WORDS were given *exclusively* to Israel—to Israel and to no other nation. This we never affirmed, but have always denied. The argument therefore rests wholly on a

false assumption; and its inference must, therefore, be wholly false. It ought to stand thus. God has given to France, England, America and all nations, the same precise elements of moral truth, as their constitutional and elementary law; therefore, all nations are bound to regulate all their legislation, according to these eternal and unchangeable principles of moral truth. From this it must follow, as a corollary inevitable, that wherein any nation legislates and governs contrary to this transcript of the divine perfections, it is sinful—it is rebellion against God, and must bring distress upon the people, and, in the end, ruin upon the government: for we ought to obey God rather than men. If human governors run counter to the TEN WORDS, it is tyranny; for God has never given them such authority; and obedience to God then is resistance to tyrants. And this is the only sense, in which there is such a thing, as the *right* of revolution by force of arms; and thus it is, that an appeal to arms is carrying the cause to the highest court.

2. But we are told, there are a great many modifications, additions, alterations, amendments to the *ten words*, utterly inapplicable to us and to other nations; and therefore we cannot admit their binding force. For example, this very law of the fourth commandment is punished with death. Is every man who gathers an armful of sticks on Sunday, to be stoned to death?

This brings up a legion of objections; and demands a very deliberate response. In the close of this paper, I can only lay down the general principle, on which they must all be disposed of. Our answers in detail will largely correspond with the views of the objector himself; but for very different reasons.

Our principle is this—that legislation is clearly distinct from fundamental law. If America has learned one lesson of paramount importance to her and to the world, it is this: that a Constitution of elementary moral principles, rising high above all governmental officers—legislative, judicial, executive—is necessary to the public safety. No sooner had she emerged from the Red Sea of a bloody Revolution—rather, I should say, whilst still enclosed within the blood-stained walls—she groped around in search of some rock foundation on which to erect the temple of freedom. Deeply did the men of that day feel, amid the tremendous surges of that agitated sea, that the quicksands of human ignorance and passion could never bear up the glorious structure of Constitutional Liberty which they were erecting as a Pharos, to guide the enthralled nations into the haven of peace and a government of law. The yearnings of their souls went forth continually after a system of elementary principles which should constitute the rule of all rulers and the guide of all the people. A Constitution involving the pure moral elements of all

government they laboured after, and in thirteen years they found it, and founded it upon the broad basis of the people's will, whose voice, coalescing with the voice from Sinai, became to them the voice of God.

## CHAPTER VI.

### ARGUMENT FOR THE SABBATH, FROM THE CHARACTER OF ITS OPPOSERS.

The fruits prove the tree—good or bad.

"By their fruits ye shall know them," is a very simple rule of judgment. It is the principle of all inductive science. It was not discovered nor invented by Bacon. Newton's head was not its original source. These reformers of philosophy, renovators of the true law of philosophizing, found it in the Bible, and their application of it to natural science placed them at its head. But manifestly, this maxim of our Saviour is an inductive process. Like causes produce like effects: and I infer the nature of the cause from its effect. If this shrub bear figs, it is not a thistle: if this one produce grapes, it is a vine, and not a thorn-bush. If blasphemy flow from this man's mouth, he is not a holy man with the fear of God before his eyes and the love of God in his heart. If this man wash his hands from keeping of bribes; if he do good to men as he hath opportunity; if he avoid all evil and appearance of evil; if he visit the

fatherless and the widows in their affliction, and keep himself unspotted from the world; ye shall know him by his fruits; he is a good man. If a man say, "I love God," and yet hateth his brother, you cannot believe his words; you cannot do otherwise than believe his actions: you judge the tree by its fruits. In the absence of holy living, no man can have in himself, or give unto others, proof that he is a converted man and on the way to heaven. But if his walk be holy; his life pure; his whole course of action conformed to the law and love of the Lord; inductive science infers, without a faltering fear, that he is a changed man. Now it is by furnishing the facts for this philosophy that every true Christian makes himself, or rather is made, by Divine grace, a preacher of Christ's gospel; he lets his light so shine before men, that they cannot avoid the conclusion that his religion is from above; and they are constrained to glorify his Father in heaven.

Now, if we apply this first law of experimental philosophy—of inductive science—to the question whether the Bible is from God, or whether it is an imposition upon the credulity of mankind, we shall reach a satisfactory result. We have only to glance for a brief moment at the character of the friends of the Holy Book, and then at that of its enemies, to reach this conclusion. Reader! just look around you. There stand the men and the women by thousands who reverence this Book, and evince this

reverential regard by reading and studying it with all the helps within their reach: they attend the exposition of it by men of educated and trained minds, wholly devoted to this work: they ponder it themselves; it is their daily companion in the house and by the way. Everything they can do is done to increase their acquaintance with its precious contents. Moreover, they practise its heavenly doctrines—these are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. Now look at their moral and religious character. How do they stand inspection? Are they, as a class, unreliable men and women? Can you rest upon their moral integrity? Will you admit their testimony in court as decisive of the most important interests of their fellow-men? When charity utters her calls to the relief of suffering humanity, do you find a listening ear? Who feeds the hungry poor? Who clothes the naked? Who visits the sick and afflicted?

Now turn to the other side. Mark the opponents of the Bible and scoffers at the doctrines it contains. Do none of them blaspheme God and curse men? Do none of them give or take bribes at elections or in the lobbies of legislative halls? Are they active in staying the progress of vice and immorality? Do they, as a class, set a beautiful example of moral purity, and stand distinguished for all the moral virtues, so as to abash the workers of iniquity, and commend, by their own example, the ways of holi-

ness and truth; and thus constrain men to glorify God in a pure life? Reader! you know the reverse of all this is true; the notorious facts constantly passing before your eyes demonstrate the haters of the Bible to be far different. The inference you cannot resist: it follows by the resistless power of eternal logic. The Bible must be a good book, because its friends and admirers are good men; its enemies and revilers are bad men.

Parallel with this is our argument. What is the moral character of the friends and the enemies of the Sabbath day respectively?

Again, Reader! look around you. What are the facts? We observe, first, that the day of sacred rest has a civil, even a worldly aspect, as we have seen. Human legislation has embraced it, as it has the other commandments, because they bear favourably upon the social and pecuniary benefits of the country: and *therefore* men, in very great numbers, favour the general observance of the day. Without taking particular interest in its religious influences, they see and recognize its benefits in other regards, and give it, for the sake of these, a general approbation. Now among this large class, we do not deny but that some may be found of loose morality, and may be cited against us. This would be unfair: for this whole class, after all, are not friends of the sacred day of rest in our meaning of it: but only of one aspect, and that the least

important, of its benefits. The only fair comparison must be limited to those who take the law in its totality, as a Divine ordinance requiring rest physical; but whose main substance, spirit, and life lie in its religious character, as a day kept holy to the Lord. They only are friends of the Sabbath who adhere to it, as it is a day of rest from worldly employments and recreations, and of religious consecration to the worship and service of God. Now, we ask you to look around and mark the moral conduct of this large class of men, women, and children. Where do you find them on the holy day? Roaming the streets? crowding the rum shops and beer houses, in violation of Penn's GREAT LAW? In riot and dissipation around these haunts of vice? Rushing to the country on fast horses or steam cars, to the infinite annoyance of peaceful dwellers and their fruit-beds, orchards, and gardens? In the lock-ups on Sunday nights and in the alderman's office on Monday morning? Or do you find them in the early day at home—sweet, lovely home—"reading the Scriptures of truth," as Penn directs and recommends—and the children conning over their Sunday-school lessons? Then passing quietly, cheerfully, peaceably to the Sunday-school room—then to the church and its sacred exercises? Then, the worship over, returning in the same order to the delightful home and its holy quiet. Again you see the repetition of the sacred solemnities and the day closing in the beautiful sunshine of heaven's

approbation. On other days, diligent in business; honest in their dealings; never indulging in profane or obscene language; kind to the poor; given to hospitality; always ready for every good work; fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.

Now, how is it with the opponents of the Sabbath day? Strange that it should be so; but do not the Jews, who still deny the Lord, abhor his holy day? Do not Deists—deniers of the Divine inspiration of the Scriptures; atheists—deniers of the being of a God; do not profane swearers; do not gamblers; do not corrupters of the public morals and murderers of thousands by the sale of alcoholic poisons; do not the entire body of their customers and victims; do not debauchees, forgers, burglars, incendiaries, and all persons of bad moral character, —do they not all affiliate, and unite, and combine "together against the Lord, and against his anointed; Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us?" These inuendoes are general truths. The few among them who do not so affiliate and combine, are most assuredly the exceptions rare. In reference to the mass, this is no slander, unless in the sense of the effete English maxim, "The greater the truth the greater the libel." Be it that they will take offence at this position. If it were not true they would have little occasion for offence, and less profit from their displeasure. But they will curse you. Very well, "The curse causeless shall not come." "Shimei cursed David and cast

stones;" and David said, "Let him curse." And Solomon says, "The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked." "The Lord turned the curse of Balaam into a blessing." This all I speak for their good. See Appendix XI.

## CHAPTER VII.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF ISRAEL—THIS CONSTITUTION, PURELY RELIGIOUS AND MORAL.

Ratification—The commandments means the ten—Adopted not by tribes, but as a nation—Examination of the ten words—The fourth passed by.

We have seen, from Exod. xix. 5–8, that God made a covenant with Israel, before the utterance of the TEN WORDS from the summit of the burning Mount; *now* we affirm, that after this awful and glorious utterance, this covenant was more formally confirmed and ratified in the blood of typical sacrifice. Exod. xxiv. 4, 5. "And Moses wrote all the words of the law—7. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said we will do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people; and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Another ratification of this federal compact—this national constitution, took place forty years afterward on the plains of Moab: Deut. xxix. 1, 2–14, "Neither with

you only do I make this covenant and this oath"—I know, it may be affirmed that other items are probably included in this covenant. vi. "These are the words of the covenant, which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, beside the covenant which he made with them in Horeb." I answer, if other matter is here included, the commandments are specifically referred to Chap. xxvii. 1. "Keep all the commandments which I command you this day." Now, when the commandments are spoken of by themselves; or in connection with other terms—as in—Deut. viii. 11, "Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God, in not keeping his commandments, and his judgments and his statutes." So in Deut. iv. 13, "And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments: and he wrote them upon two tables of stone:" and in the next verse, "*statutes* and *judgments*" are contradistinguished from commandments:—whenever these are mentioned, our position here is, that the ten words of the two tables are meant. Such is the New Testament usage. Mark x. 19, "Thou knowest the commandments. Do not commit adultery. Do not kill. Do not steal," &c. So Luke, i. 6, "And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments, and ordinances of the Lord blameless." Jno. xiv. 21, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." Such is also the

Old Testament usage: the word occurs in Ps. cxix. eighteen times, and in every instance, in reference to the *ten words*. "And he—God, wrote on the tables (which Moses hewed out) according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spoke unto you in the mount," &c. Deut. x. 4. Beyond doubt, by the phrase, *the commandments*, the law of the two tables is meant. And it is of these our Lord declares, Mat. v. 18,—"Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." And Luke xvi. 17, "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." "The word of our God shall stand for ever." Our conclusion is safe.

The TEN COMMANDMENTS are THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION of the Hebrew commonwealth. They constitute the fundamental law of his people: they became such by the appointment of God and the election of the people. They have been solemnly inaugurated as such, by a formal federal compact: —an inauguration, which, for solemnity, pomp, grandeur and glory, has no parallel in the world's history.

A few words, as to this adoption of the federal compact seem proper; to guard against misapprehension and mischief therefrom. 1. No convention or committee of the thirteen tribes met, deliberated and drew up the original draft of this constitution, and thus first gave it form. This was done to their hand by God himself. Herein it differs from the

federal constitution of the Anglo-Saxon Commonwealth. Nevertheless the framers of our constitution, ever and anon, felt themselves bound and bounded by that of the Hebrews. I say bound, because these wise men, like all wise men the world over, recognized the Decalogue,—that is, to translate this Greek word into English, *the ten words*, as a transcript of the divine attributes, the common law of humanity. I say bounded—because they felt, that no moral principle—no political doctrine could be found outside of the Hebrew constitution—that is, they knew, that the elements of all moral rules, requisite for human society and its governments, are found within this Hebrew constitution.

2. It was *federal*—by covenant, in the strictest sense; God offered it to Israel, with a guaranty of protection, peace, prosperity, happiness, provided they would accept and keep it in good faith. The people consented, and assented, and pledged themselves to obedience. Thus it is federal: and herein it resembles our adoption of our Constitution, though differing as to origin: and not much, neither. For what God did for Israel by miraculous interposition, he did for us by providential arrangements, approaching to the miraculous. He hedged up our way so that we could not avoid making just such a Constitution.

3. The Hebrew people compacted with themselves and with God through delegates or representatives—the elders of the people, in their behalf, signed the

bond and sealed the covenant with blood. Herein our case and theirs agree, except in the matter of typical blood. The people, by their representatives, adopted the Constitution.

4. The Hebrew Constitution was adopted, not by representatives of the thirteen Tribes as distinct and organized bodies, but by the elders of the people of Israel *as a nation*—"Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and *an holy nation*." Their tribal distinctions were never noticed in this adopting act; but always are they viewed and spoken of as one people—a nation—and their fundamental law was adopted by the NATION. There is here a parallelism between these *thirteen tribes* and our *thirteen States*. Our Constitution was adopted, not by and in the name of the States as States: not one of the conventions of the people in any one of the States ever stated, in their adopting act, that they did it in the name of the *State*, but always, in the name of the *People*.

That the Decalogue is a summary compend of God's moral law, is and always has been the sentiment of the Christian world. Aware I am that Rome, as she ceased to be a true Christian Church, repudiated the *second* commandment. This reform became necessary for her justification in the worship of and by images, and saints, the virgin and the host. But evangelical Christendom, with such few exceptions as are scarcely worthy of notice, have sustained the TEN WORDS, as containing the essence

of all moral truth. The usual division into duties to God and duties to man, is substantially correct: the first table containing the former, and the second the latter.

Of course the reader does not expect, here and now, an exposition of the Decalogue. All you can expect and desire, is simply such a brief notice of its contents as the proof of my proposition requires; and this accompanied by evidence that no peculiarity of the Jewish people is contained in any one of the ten; but that, on the contrary, all these laws are equally applicable to all men and nations as to the Hebrew nation. With this in view, the method is exceedingly simple, viz., to take up the precepts seriatim; leaving, however, the fourth to the last place. And also let us bear in mind that all the ten are negative precepts, except the fifth and the former half of the fourth. And that, therefore, the common sense rule must be adopted in their interpretation; that where a sin is forbidden, the contrary duty is commanded; and where a duty is commanded, the contrary sin is forbidden. And moreover, that all the Ten are addressed to the individual: if every person obeys the law, the social body obeys it, for society, governments, nations, are made up of individuals.

The first commandment is, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Jehovah here asserts his right to the worship and adoration of every individual, to the exclusion of everything which men or

devils may set up as gods. Here is the prime element of religious obligation. Nothing ceremonial here: nothing peculiar to the Jew. Nothing but what is the duty of every rational and moral agent in the universe.

The second—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them." This is the commandment, as distinguished from the reason enforcing it. It is obviously counterpart to the first. It forbids the substitution of anything in the place of God as an object of religious worship and adoration:—forbids idolatry in all and every form. Is there anything here peculiar to the Israelite? Or is it not a duty, proper to every moral creature? All men and all nations and at all times are equally bound by it. And the reason is equally general, "For I, the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." Here is no allusion even to any peculiar claim or obligation upon the Jew. No ceremonial institute is here. Everything affirmed or implied is common to all the race of Adam.

The *third*—"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold

him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Here is a purely moral duty enjoined—reverence in the use of the holy names of God. If this be not a moral and religious duty, what can be? And where is there anything ceremonial or peculiar to the Israelite in it? Was there ever a time, or will there ever be a time when the individual, or a nation and people where this duty was not binding? The allegation that it is a law peculiar to the Jewish people is as absurd as it is false. Can blasphemy, profanity, perjury ever cease to be sinful? Satan himself has not brazen falsehood enough to affirm it.

The fifth, "Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." This is the only command purely positive in its form. It contains the principle of subordination to lawful authority. It is the basis of all government in the hands of men. Without it human society is impossible; and, of course, the continuance of the race would be impossible. Is the basis of all social obligation a peculiarity of the Hebrew nation?—a mere Jewish municipal regulation? Silly! simply silly assertion.

But a learned Scotch divine has caught a Jew here, in the promise of long life and prosperity—"The land which the Lord thy God hath given thee," he says means nothing but Canaan; and he avers, God never gave the land of Canaan to him, therefore he, not being a heritor of the land, cannot be bound to obey his own father or mother, or

Queen Victoria herself! Beautiful logic! Peculiarly beautiful in the land of Scotland which, if we mistake not, God gave to Knox, Chalmers and McLeod. Does this gentleman believe, this is the interpretation given in the 133d question of the Larger Catechism, which he has solemnly bound himself to hold and teach? Or does he not know it is the contradictory of it? And assuredly it is as absurd as it is novel. The land which the Lord giveth to any man, is the land where he lives. There is not a hint of its limitation to Canaan. It is equally applicable to all the dwellers on earth, as it was to the Jew at Sinai: and the man who denies the moral obligation of this commandment, will, if consistent, abrogate all law and all human society.

*Sixth.* "Thou shalt not kill." Is this a moral law? or a Jewish ceremonial institute?

*Seventh.* "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Is this too a Jewish ceremonial? Then how can it bind a Scotch doctor of divinity? And are all but Jews free from this badge of slavery to a foreign yoke?

*Eighth.* "Thou shalt not steal." And is honesty exclusively a Jewish virtue, and all the rest of mankind left free to steal?

*Ninth.* "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." This too was buried with Christ in his grave, and we have nothing to do with these dead statutes of a dead religion.

*Tenth.* "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's

house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife; nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's."

Are these hankerings after my neighbour's property sins only in a Jew; and are all men besides at liberty to covet with impunity? But I forbear. These nine precepts are religiously and morally binding upon all men in all ages of the world. There is not one principle or phase of an idea in the whole that is peculiar to Israel. This has always been the sentiment of evangelical Christendom.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF ISRAEL PURELY MORAL, CONTINUED — FOURTH COMMANDMENT ANALYZED.

We have demonstrated the moral nature, and, therefore, the binding obligation of all these nine words upon all mankind. It remains to analyze the Fourth, which, in more senses than one, is the *central* commandment. It is so in position, physically, as it were. It is so as to its moral substance; for it includes duties to God, and also some of our duties to man.

The commandment involves five distinct points, viz.:

1. First, *Remember* the day of the Sabbath.
2. The purpose or object—to *keep it holy.*
3. Rest implies *previous labour.*
4. From all labour there must be a *total cessation.*
5. The *reason* enforcing the precept.

1. *Remember* the day of *the* Sabbath.

We translate the Hebrew article, as it gives direction to the central thought. "Remember the

day of *the* Rest," obviously refers to it as previously known and now recalled. It thus gives point to the imperative word, *Remember*. And here we must be indulged in a little metaphysics. Memory is that power of the mind by which we have a knowledge of things gone by and viewed in past time. It is well defined—Conception, with a feeling of relation to past time: and it has two distinctions, created by the two laws of suggestion, which regulate the introduction of thoughts into the mind; viz., nearness in time and place; and resemblance. The memory of contiguity, or nearness, is the most common, and characterizes the uneducated mind. The memory that calls up thoughts by resemblance is the scientific—the philosophic. Both kinds are only partly voluntary. We cannot call up a former thought by an act of volition direct. The effort to do so is *reminiscence*, and implies a feeling of want and vague notion about something capable of supplying it. Hence *desire* holds the mind in expectancy. Things *desirable* are cherished and retained, and so become recallable by contiguity. Things undesirable—for which, from whatever reason, we have no desire—are not retained, secure no *attention*, or but little, and so pass away beyond the mind's purview and are lost. Such, by reason that the carnal mind is enmity against God, is the fate of the sacred duties of the Sabbath day. The Sabbath is not to it "a delight —the holy of the Lord, honourable;" its duties are

ignored, because the Lord, whose day it is, appears to careless men as a root out of a dry ground, having no form nor comeliness. Hence the necessity of this arrest of attention; "Remember the day of the rest." *Forgetfulness* results from want of *desire*, and want of desire from indifference, disrelish, want of adaptation of the objects to promote the mind's enjoyment. Now, in spiritual things, this defect lies in the heart's alienation from God. "They have both seen and hated both me and my Father," and therefore the Lord's day and its sacred duties, so delightful and so desirable to true Christians, excite no interest, but disgust rather. "When will the new moon [which was *a* Sabbath peculiar to Jews] be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" Am. viii. 5. These people's desires are not set on sacred things, but on worldly aggrandizement—"to buy and sell and get gain"—this is everything; and so "they make the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsify the balances by deceit, that they may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes." Hence the necessity of a reminder. Beyond doubt, the command to remember is designed, because needed, as a prophylactic remedy against neglect.

2. The purpose for which we are commanded to remember it, is "to keep it holy." We have already remarked, that time is incapable of a moral quality. Holiness is an attribute of an intelligent moral being

only. Time is consecrated or kept holy when we spend it in holy, religious exercises. No better account of this matter can be desired, than Isaiah's. Chap. lviii. 13, "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day: and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honourable; and shalt honour him, not finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words"—lvi. 2, "Blessed is the man,—that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it." Is time capable of moral turpitude? What is time? An intelligent, rational, moral agent? You see the absurdity. The only positive sanctification conceivable, is the devotion of ourselves to the worship, the praise and glorifying of God:—"Thou shalt delight thyself in the Lord." "It is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God"—appropriated by himself, and to himself, for his most holy worship.

It is not my purpose to enter at large into the positive duties of the holy day; but to prove it a moral law, prescribed by his Creator for the good of man. But now, if the day is to be spent in intellectual, moral and religious culture, and the worship of God, for his glory and our good, it cannot be spent in servile labour, in secular and worldly pursuits. This leads us to the negative part of our analysis.

3. Rest implies previous action, and cessation therefrom. "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work; but the seventh is the Sabbath of the

Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Total suspension of secular business is commanded. This is the indispensable negative side of the question. Whether the positive part even here, is a command—"Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work," I shall not discuss; but only say, I see no good reason to deny it. Industry is certainly a Christian virtue—a duty binding upon all to whom any talent whatever is committed—"Occupy till I come." If "diligence in business" is a duty, as well as fervency in the service of the Lord, it is because he has commanded both. For the will of God revealed to man for the rule of his conduct, is law. "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." The Saviour knew no higher obligation. If then, he forbids labour on a given day, it is equally binding with a positive precept: and he who does any work on "the Sabbath of the Lord," transgresses his command—resisteth his will. This negative precept covers all under the command and control of any man—son, daughter, servant, stranger. And this last is the most difficult to manage. In our country, it is the foreign element that gives most trouble. Foreigners seem determined to force a European and Romish Sunday upon this Protestant nation.

4. The six days, and the seventh day are of the same kind. Six are to be devoted to secular, and

one to sacred services. The question as to the seventh day controversy, we postpone for the present. One day in seven, on a regular succession, is manifestly the spirit of the law.

5. The reason supporting the precept claims our attention. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." Here note

(1.) To bless is to make or declare a person happy, as before stated. The idea of time being itself made happy is absurd. But God's worship makes man happy that day.

(2.) The *Sabbath day*, it was, which the Lord blessed and made holy, not the *seventh* day. As will be shown hereafter, the phrase, "seventh day," is never used in the Bible as the name of the day of holy rest; and the word *Sabbath* is never used but to signify a time of holy rest.

(3.) That this fourth command is a moral law; and not in any sense restricted to the Jewish people, is manifest from the reason embodied within it. The preamble to a resolution, a law, a constitution, is the index to its interpretation: it gives the reason beforehand. The same is true, when the reason is given anywhere. It were perfectly easy to throw this into that form; "Whereas in six days the Lord, &c., wherefore the Lord blessed the rest day, &c." Now this reason is not peculiar to the Jewish people, but it is common to all mankind. It is purely

moral; not an item in it or about it relates to any Jewish ceremonial. Therefore, the law, for which it gives the reason, is a moral law, binding upon all mankind, and is equally appropriate to Jew and Gentile. "The rest day was made for man." Some fifty years ago, Judge Rush, in an address to the Grand Inquest of Philadelphia county, pressed this argument with great force. He showed, that as the reason given in the law itself, is a moral reason, common and applicable to all mankind, the law could not be special and peculiar to the Hebrew people; but must be general and obligatory upon all mankind.

## CHAPTER IX.

### ALL JEWISH PECULIARITIES ARE LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS, NOT CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS.

Some Constitution necessary.—Distinction between Law and Penalty.—1. The Passover.—2. The Tabernacle.—3. Servants.—4. Usury Laws.—5. Penalties vary, law is unchangeable.—Death penalty to six of the commandments.

READER, do we understand one another? Do we agree that the organic law of a nation—the elementary and fundamental principles of its government, the CONSTITUTION—is its safeguard and bond of union, without which it would not be a nation, but only a gregarious mass—a mob? Are we agreed that this Constitutional Bond lies above, limits and controls all legislation; and that, consequently, all laws contravening the Constitution must be null and void? If we herein agree, then we cannot differ as to the possibility, probability, yea, certainty, that, if numerous laws are made so subordinate, they will sometimes branch forth in their details into minute regulations peculiar to that particular nation. Suppose the people of Alabama and those of Vermont were distinct and independent nations; and that each and both would adopt

the TEN WORDS as their Constitution; how long would it be before their legislation would exhibit distinct peculiarities, mutually inapplicable to each other? Diversity of climate, and therefore of soil, and therefore of productions, and therefore of industry, and therefore of commerce, would force upon them laws correspondent to all these diversities. For example, Vermont legislation would have an eye to lumber, to maple sugar, to live stock, and especially sheep and wool. Alabama legislation would regard sugar cane, cotton, rice, &c. The laws of each thus become utterly inapplicable to the other. Thus Hebrew legislation, under the very same constitution which God gave as the moral, elementary law to the Greek, the Roman, the Egyptian, produces laws and regulations peculiar to them and unsuitable to other nations.

One other general principle will prepare us for some detail, viz.: That *a law* and *its penalty* are quite *distinct*. Be it that a law without a penalty appropriated to its violation is mere counsel or advice. This alters not the case; for all human legislation exhibits changes interminable in penalties, whilst the law, *i. e.*, the rule prescribing duty, remains unchanged. For example, under the constitutional law of the eighth precept, "Thou shalt not steal," how vastly diversified is human legislation! English law awarded death even for petit larceny; time and Christianity have changed this. American legislation, very soon after the trammels of English

law were thrown off, produced the same change; but still with great diversity of penal enactment. Similar diversities exist as to modes of the one capital punishment—hanging, beheading, strangling, stoning, poisoning, burning, drowning. But all these diversities in penalty, both as to degree of severity and mode of infliction, involve no alteration in the organic law itself: it still remains the same, "Thou shalt not kill." And this springs from the distinction between law and penalty—a distinction nowhere more strongly marked than in the TEN WORDS. No penalty was uttered from the summit of Sinai. No penalty was written on the two tables of stone. No penalty is anywhere recorded in the Constitution of the Hebrew Commonwealth. No penalty is registered in the Constitution of the United States. A prophylactic is set forth in the eighth amendment, against "cruel and unusual punishments." But, except removal from office and disqualification, no penalty, not even for treason, is prescribed in that wonderful instrument. Of all this, the philosophy is not difficult of comprehension. It is found in the *object* of penalty. This is two-fold:—to vindicate justice in asserting and sustaining the majesty of law; and to prevent future transgression: the former being principal, the latter subsidiary. The English judge who elevated the latter above the former by saying to the horse-thief, "We hang you, sir, not because you stole a horse, but to prevent horses from being

stolen," showed his ignorance of the foundation principle of government, and his belief that an English horse is worth more than an Englishman. Justice is a fixed guaranty; penalty is a contingency. The law is immutable; but its violations are, as to aggravations, interminably variable; and so, therefore, must the punishments be. Hence, the world over, a wide discretionary margin is left to the judges.

Let us now open the Hebrew code, and observe some of the ramifications of elementary law in the legislative enactments under it. And the first institution to be cited is a kind of prolepsis in historical development. It was an act of the legislator, acting under the elementary law, yet before its formal enunciation. Of course the Passover feast is referred to. The Passover services belong chiefly to the first table; they are covered, as to their principle, by the command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," which contains the proposition, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Its spirit is also found in the second, which prohibits idolatry, and enjoins holy and reverend use of Divinely-instituted worship. The Fourth in spirit is here also, for it includes and commemorates deliverance from servitude, devotion of time to sacred services, and always includes one Sabbath day devoted to the Lord and his regular worship, inclusive of the typical sacri-

fices, and referring to Christ our Passover, sacrificed for us.

Now, this institution we hold to be a law of Israel: formal subjection to it belongs not to the Church under the gospel: it was a shadow of good things: the substance to which it refers is ours; but the form is ritual and ceremonial, and dies by limitation.

2. The Tabernacle, with its Court, and Brazen Altar, and Laver, and Candlestick, and Table of Show-bread, and Golden Altar of Incense, and Ark of the Testimony—including the entire system of burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, incense-offerings,—all these are formal and legal, and yet outgrowths of legislation, under and consistent with the organic law, but repealable and mortal by their own limitation. The substance is of Christ, and is immutable and eternal; but the shadows pass away in their own proper time. The tables of stone may be broken and lost, but the heavenly Constitution abides for ever. The tendency, drift, and design of this system, and indeed of the whole ceremonial institutions, is to direct and lead to the fulfilment of law; the tables being the grand centre of all Jewish worship—presenting, under a wonderful diversity of instrumental symbols, instructions as to the preservation of the Organic Law intact, and as to the means of restoration of the worshippers to a state of acceptance and Divine favour. They are, in fact, all evangelical in their doctrinal substance.

3d Example may be the regulations relative to servants, Exod. xxi. 1–11, and many others in the same chapter. They are called "judgments which thou shalt set before the people." "If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve; and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself," etc., etc. So xxii. 1: "If a man shall steal an ox or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep." Great numbers of such laws were enacted, in application of the principles in the Constitution to the various conditions of the people. But all these are manifestly municipal regulations, and are subject to amendment, repeal, or modification, thus differing entirely from organic law.

4. A fourth example of this kind is the usury laws. By usury the Hebrews meant *interest*, not exactly what we mean by it, viz., *unlawful interest*. We undertake, foolishly enough, to fix by law the amount that shall be paid for the use of money; and great is the mischief and moral corruption occasioned—perhaps I might say *caused*—by our legislation about usury. The Hebrew Lawgiver, more wise, undertakes nowhere this thing so unreasonable. The usufruct value of money can no more be fixed and defined by municipal rule, than that of horses, or cows, or butter. Moses prohibits absolutely any interest to be exacted of a Hebrew for the use of money. Exod. xxii. 25: "If thou lend money to

any of my people that is poor by thee, thou shalt not be to him as a usurer, neither shalt thou lay upon him usury." So repeating and expanding the law. Levit. xxv. 35–37: "Take thou no usury of him, nor increase. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase." And Deut. xxiii. 19, 20: "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother: usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury. Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury, but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury." The reason of this municipal regulation is evident on its face: it is special to the Hebrew people, and not binding in its specialty upon us; although its moving principle, brotherly love, belongs to the Constitution of Israel and of mankind: the charitable provision for the poor is a duty; but the form is ceremonial.

It is surely unnecessary to proceed farther in detail of these legislative enactments, it being my object, simply to illustrate by example, the difference between the law of THE TEN WORDS, which is common to man; and Jewish legislation under it, which is peculiar to the Israelitish people.

The other class of cases arises from the difference between law, as a rule of action, and penalty as an enforcement of rule. Strictly speaking, no duty can be enforced, *i. e.*, you cannot compel a man and thus bring him up to performance of his duty. The reason is plain; *duty* must be the voluntary outgo

of the heart in reverential subjection to the Governor's will. Unless a man does the will of God, cheerfully, voluntarily, willingly, he performs no duty, however right the thing he does may be in itself. You cannot force a man to keep the Sabbath holy: any more than you can force a child to love and obey its parents. All you can do, is to hold up a choice between outward physical compliance and punishment. Thus a motive, based on self-love, which shrinks from suffering the penalty, is added, to strengthen the sense of moral obligation to obedience.

Penalty, then, as distinguished from law, may be varied in the same country at different times; and in different countries at the same time. This variation is occasioned *chiefly*, perhaps solely by the secondary object of it; viz., its tendency to prevent crime. For this end the character of the person deserving punishment, his upbringing, his surroundings; a thousand circumstances come in to modify and adjust punishment. "A reproof entereth more into a wise man, than a hundred stripes into a fool." Hence, no government pretends to gauge all penalties by statute: but all, from Moses to our day, leave a large discretion to the judges. Now the error which we wish here to correct, is the supposition that the law is changed, because the penalty is modified. History abundantly testifies that wherever Christianity has gone, the penal code has been relaxed and meliorated. In the days of the Stuarts,

more than one hundred and fifty crimes were punished with death. But whilst these great changes were in progress, the laws themselves remained unchanged. When the punishment of death ceased to be inflicted for theft, the eighth commandment remained the same.

Now so is it in the Hebrew commonwealth. The penalty for the violation of most of the TEN WORDS, was death: which to us now seems unreasonably severe: yet were they not at all more so, than were common to other nations of the same age.

For example, the penalty for transgression of the *third* commandment is death. Lev. xiv. 16, "And he that blasphemeth the Lord, he shall surely be put to death." The same death by stoning was inflicted for a violation of the *first* and *second* commandments. Deut. xiii. 6–9. And xvii. 2–7,—"And hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun or the moon, or any of the host, which I have not commanded—thou shalt bring forth that man or that woman—and shalt stone them with stones till they die."

In like manner, the *fifth* precept. Exod. xxi. 17 —Lev. xx. 9, "Every one that curseth his father or his mother, shall be surely put to death." And the *seventh*. Lev. xx. 10–13, "The adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death." Equally equivocal is the testimony in regard to the *sixth*. Num. xxxv. 16–31, "The murderer shall surely be put to death—ye shall take no satisfaction for the

life of a murderer, which is guilty of death; but he shall be surely put to death."

Here then are six out of the TEN WORDS, to which no penalties are affixed in the Decalogue, but to which the highest penalty is affixed by Jewish legislation. Our Pennsylvania code awards this punishment to only one of the six. Does this prove that the other five are not moral laws binding upon us, but only ceremonial regulations of the Jews? Must we hold to the sixth as moral, and abandon the five as ceremonial? And that, simply because Hebrew legislation has appended penalties, which we deem unsuitable to us, in our greatly ameliorated condition of the penal code?

## CHAPTER X.

### SET FEASTS, OR EXTRA SABBATHS.

Col. ii. 16 vindicated against our opponents.—New moons.—Passover.—Trumpets.—Atonement day.—Tabernacles.—Romans xv. 5, 6.

A CHIEF source of error in the Sabbatic controversy, is found in the Hebrew festivals, or special sacred days of that people. These were, by acts of legislation, peculiar to them, and for them alone. They involve the REST principle—cessation from labour, and consecration of the times specified to public religious worship—and therefore are called *Sabbaths*, and hence are often confounded with the weekly Sabbath. Let us inquire into them and extricate the general subject from this confusion.

1. The monthly solemn observance is most fully set forth in Num. xxviii. 11–15: "And in the beginnings of your months, ye shall offer a burnt-offering unto the LORD;" the detail is given. It is immediately preceded by the sacrifices for the weekly Sabbath, and that by the daily offerings. It does not appear that the new moons were days of holy convocation and rest from servile labour. Yet Amos

viii. 5 seems, in his reproof of the eager and avaricious spirit of traffic, to imply as much. "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" Still, it is nowhere expressly called a Sabbath.

2. We pass on to the great feasts of the Passover and unleavened bread. Num. xxviii. 16–25: "And in the fourteenth day of the first month is the Passover of the LORD." Verse 18: "In the first day shall be an holy convocation; ye shall do no manner of servile work therein." Then the sacrifices are prescribed; and verse 25: "And on the seventh day ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work." Here we have two days of rest from all worldly labour; and public assemblies for worship by sacrifices—Sabbaths in fact; the first of the seven being the fifteenth day of the month. It is impossible that both these days should be the regular weekly Sabbath. Yea, it must generally happen, that neither could be; yet the seven must comprehend one regular sacred, weekly Sabbath. So Deut. xvi. 8: "Six days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to the LORD thy God: thou shalt do no work therein." The same is repeated in Lev. xxiii. 4–8. Two Sabbaths; every element of Sabbatic rest is here, except the name—cessation from work, public assembly, and public worship.

3. The feast of trumpets has all these elements,

and the name also. Lev. xxiii. 24, 25: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a Sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work therein; but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD." Here is *a Sabbath*, which is not the weekly rest day.

4. "Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement; it shall be an holy convocation unto you, and ye shall do no work in that same day. For whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people. It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest; from even unto even ye shall celebrate your Sabbath." Lev. xxiii. 27–31; xvi. 31. This is *a* Sabbath, but not *the* weekly rest day. The first day and the tenth day of this seventh month are special Sabbaths, peculiar to the Hebrew people, appointed by the same Divine authority which at the creation blessed and sanctified the Sabbath day. Both these never could be the day of weekly rest; and very rarely, if ever, could either of them be so. It is from this special rest day the error was derived by the Jews and others, that the regular weekly Sabbath begins in the evening; for which opinion, as we shall see anon, there is no Scriptural authority: for this misunderstanding is not authority.

5. Again, verse 34: "The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles for

seven days unto the LORD. On the first day shall be an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein. On the eighth day shall be an holy convocation unto you. A solemn assembly, and ye shall do no servile work therein." This is repeated at verse 39: And these days, the first and the eighth, are expressly called Sabbaths: "on the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a Sabbath."

We have therefore seven—viz., in Nos. 1 and 2, —3; and in Nos. 3, 4, and 5,—4 Sabbaths: Nos. 1 and 2 not so named, but including all the elements; of the rest day: the four in Nos, 3, 4, and 5, including both the elements and the express name of Sabbath. But all the seven are expressly contained in verses 38, 39. "These are the feasts of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations. Besides the Sabbaths of the LORD, and beside your gifts, and besides all your vows, and beside all your free-will offerings, which ye give unto the LORD." Nor must we neglect the contrast between these set feasts, these extra Sabbaths and the *Sabbaths of the* LORD. The weekly rest day is contra-distinguished. In verse 3d we read,—"It is the Sabbath of the LORD in all your dwellings:" and they are called, "My Sabbaths." But these seven are additional—extra days, *besides* the regular days of rest—"your Sabbaths."

"And Moses declared unto Israel the feasts of the LORD." Thus clearly distinguished, are the

Sabbaths of the LORD,—the regular weekly memorials of his finished work;—the eternal and unchangeable moral law; from the municipal regulations, peculiarly adapted to the Hebrews, and which, being superadded specialities, must expire with the other ceremonials of that people.

And just here, whilst these facts are before us, we may as well dispose of an argument, on which great stress is laid by the opponents of the holy day; and whose entire force is destroyed by the distinction here presented. It is built on Col. ii. 16, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day or of the new moon, or the Sabbaths." It is obvious at a glance, that the apostle is cautioning his readers against Judaizing teachers,—persons disposed to enforce observances of the ceremonial law. "Except ye be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, ye cannot be saved." For leaning in this direction Paul reproved Peter. Gal. ii. 10–16. And here he directs us to resist such influences and stand up for Christian liberty; and that we must not be entangled with the yoke of bondage. Let no man usurp authority over you and censure you because you refuse to comply with the distinctions of clean and unclean animals for food, or as to the prohibitions of drinks and drink-offerings, or of holy days—new moons or of Sabbaths. Every one of these are ceremonials of the Jewish law—shadows, types of good things to come, foreshadowing Christ. The Sabbaths are

those we have just been discussing: the three holy days, including the new moons; and the four feasts, which we have seen are Sabbaths, but not the weekly rest days. As to Paul's own conduct in regard to the weekly rest day, he constantly observed it, entering into the synagogues and reasoning out of the Scriptures: and he gives directions to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, in regard to their duties on the first day of the week; making it evident that for a while he kept and improved both the seventh and the first. Thus, there is not a particle of evidence that the weekly Sabbath is meant in this place; but only the Jewish ceremonial feast days, which must die by their own limitation.

This reasoning is applicable to Rom. xiv. 5, 6, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day *alike*." The heathens in Rome and all the world over, had their special days, like our ancestors, and like the Jews, devoted to their peculiar divinities. And it was difficult, to wean off the Jewish Christians at Rome from the feast days and annual Sabbaths above named. The questions were perplexing—are these observances binding? Must we keep these annual Sabbaths? May we omit them without sin? And the same questions yet trouble us. There are people in this enlightened age whose consciences are uneasy, at sight of desecrated Christmas day; Good-Friday; Easter-Monday, Ascension day, &c. Now, says, Paul, these are matters of utter indifference. God

has not made the Jewish annual Sabbaths binding upon us. Christmas, Good-Friday, &c., may be observed religiously and even profitably; but there is no command of God for it: and no man may justly take offence at their neglect.

## CHAPTER XI.

THE FOURTH PRECEPT—OBJECTION TO IT, BECAUSE ITS PENALTY IS TOO SEVERE—LOCAL LEGISLATION UNDER IT FOR HEBREWS.

Death penalty, as in the other eight.

THE immutability of moral law is admitted by all who admit that its home is the bosom of God. Equally universal is the concession that the penal sanctions appended to laws are mutable, and have been varying in all ages and nations. Our ninth chapter demonstrated this truth by the Scriptural examples of the first and second, the third and fifth, the sixth and seventh precepts. To neither of these, as organic laws, uttered in thunder and written on stone by Jehovah himself, did he append any penalty; but left that, as our fathers left the United States Constitution, to have its penal sanctions affixed by municipal legislation. This parallel between our national organic law and that of the Hebrew Commonwealth, is as thoroughly and graphically correct, as it is philosophically and historically true. Even treason, the highest crime known to law, has no punishment defined in the Constitution.

Such definition is left to municipal statute; and the reason has been made apparent, viz.: penalties are variable by time, place, and circumstances; but organic law must consist of purely elementary principles. We have seen that penalties were added in regard to the first, second, third, fifth, sixth, and seventh precepts. We may say, also, the eighth. For stealing a man, Deut. xxiv. 7: "Then the thief shall die." For stealing food, "he shall restore seven-fold." Prov. vi. 31.

For violating the ninth precept, the law enacting penalty is not a specific, but yet an equitable measure. "Then shall ye do unto the false witness as he had thought to have done unto his brother." Deut. xix. 19. The tenth, which aims to check sin in its incipient movement, is the only one of the TEN WORDS which hath no special penal enactment added. The reason is plain; it is violated in the heart's entertaining an illicit desire, and is not cognizable by law for punishment until it externalizes itself in overt acts, when it necessarily falls under some one of the penalties of the nine.

Now the *Fourth* is not an exception. Special, municipal laws were passed, modifying the phraseology and applying its principle, and prescribing its penalty. In these matters it is attended by just such circumstances as attend all the others. Of these we may mention first the penalty. It is, like the eight already noticed, *severe*, according to our present conceptions, which are the product of gos-

pel amelioration. So are all the rest: but so were the penalties of law in all the nations of the world at that period. *Death* seems a cruel punishment on a boy for cursing his father or his mother; or a woman for violating the rules of chastity. But such severities existed in all the nations to a much later period. All that is needful to my argument is this fact. I cannot be called upon to defend the penal code of Jewish legislation. The same God who enacted these penalties under the other organic laws of the two tables, enacted this penalty. If you charge him with cruelty, be it so: the quarrel is not mine; but be on your guard, for "if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to fight against God." Acts v. 39. Be impartial, ye that fight against God for ordering the death penalty for Sabbath breaking. So it reads, Num. xv. 35, 36: "And the LORD said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp." Did Jehovah pass a wicked and cruel law? "And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the LORD commanded Moses." Ananias and Sapphira fell down dead for coveting an evil covetousness. Acts v. Did Peter or Peter's Master, who punished them with death for lying unto God, do a great wickedness? Be ye impartial, who undertake to condemn the Hebrew legislator and Peter and his Lord for this cruelty; and God,

for inflicting death on Adam's race for his eating the fruit forbidden. Apply your objections and your condemnation to the punishments ordered for the first, second, third, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth precepts—all *capital*. You admit such punishment to be right and proper, and not cruel, only in regard to the fourth: wherefore this partiality? Pause and think a moment, and let your sense of compassion and of justice temper themselves with reverence toward God. For after all your overflow of benevolence, perhaps God is as benevolent and even as wise as you are. Perhaps he knew as well or better than you, what laws municipal were best suited to the condition of his peculiar people at that time. But I may not defend Jehovah.

Let us look at the various modifications of the Sabbatic institution: and the first of these, after the penal sanction, which was enacted in the wilderness of Sin (as we have seen,) a month and more, before the organic, constitutional law was uttered from Sinai, is found in Exodus xxxi. 13–17, "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you, throughout your generations"—and in verse 14, it is in the singular—"Ye shall keep the Sabbath, therefore: for it is holy unto you:" and the death penalty enacted in the wilderness of Sin, is re-enacted. Then verse 15, the general principle of the organic law is recited—"Six days may work be done, but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest,

holy to the LORD;" and in verse 17, "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever."

The second act repeats the first, with the addition prohibiting the kindling of fire: Exodus xxxv. 2, 3. "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein, shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day." This shows again that, the proportion of time is the chief matter—six days to worldly pursuits and one to holy, religious duties—"to the LORD."

In the order of the historic statement, the next is Leviticus xvi. 31. But as this and the Sabbaths mentioned in chapter xxiii., except verse 3, are all special and extra rests, and not the regular weekly Sabbaths, we postpone their discussion to a separate chapter: let us pursue the citation of acts of legislation under the FOURTH article of the Constitution proper. The next or *third* act is Leviticus xxiii. 3, "Six days shall work be done, but the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the LORD in all your dwellings." Here is the same proportion set forth, the same cessation of worldly labour, the same consecration of time to God's worship—the only conceivable sense in which holiness can be spoken of time. The penalty is not here named, but it prescribes public worship—"an holy convoca-

tion"—a calling together of the people for holy, sacred worship.

The *fourth* notice of legislation is in Leviticus xxiv. 8. It regards not the Sabbath, properly speaking, but simply marks it as the *time* of changing the shew-bread. "Every Sabbath he shall set it in order before the LORD continually"—no change.

The next notice of Sabbaths regards not the weekly rest day, but the Sabbatic year, Leviticus xxv. 1–8, and the Jubilee, which will be treated under the head of extra Sabbaths.

The *fifth* notice by way of legislation is found in Numbers xxviii. 9, 10, where there is direction given about the regular sacrifices for the day. "And on the Sabbath day, two lambs of the first year without spot, and two tenth-deals of flour for a meat-offering, mingled with oil, and the drink-offering thereof. This is the burnt-offering of every Sabbath, besides the continual burnt-offering, and his drink-offering."

In Deuteronomy, which is a kind of resumé of the history from the Exodus unto "the plain over against Zuph—on this side Jordan," chapter i. 1, we have a statement of the *ten words*, with some enlargements and explanations, adapted peculiarly to Israel. I will not repeat the whole, but only these amendments: and shall put in *italics* the words additional and explanatory, that the reader may see at a glance how utterly groundless is the

innuendo of anti-Sabbath men, that there is inconsistency between the repetition here and the utterances from Sinai. The only variances, except some slight ones in translating, such as, "Neither shalt thou *desire;*" instead of, "Thou shalt not *covet*," are in the fourth, fifth, and tenth. Moses says, v. 12, "*Keep* the Sabbath day *to sanctify it as the* LORD *thy God hath commanded thee;* six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, *nor* thy maid-servant, *nor thine ox, nor thine ass,* nor *any of* thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates, *that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the* LORD *thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm: therefore the* LORD *thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.*"

"Honour thy father and thy mother, *as the* LORD *thy God hath commanded thee:* that thy days may be *prolonged, and that it may go well with thee in* the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee." Verse 21. "*Neither* shalt thou *desire* thy neighbour's wife, neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house, *his field,* nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbour's."

The reader sees at once that here is, as it were,

a paraphrase—a little expansion and addition, and an omission of the reason of the Fourth—but no inconsistency between Moses and his Divine Master. Legislation under a Constitution may cite its language; but, if it give nothing but its language, it is not legislation at all, only repetition.

We have now before us all the legislation which has occurred under the FOURTH ARTICLE of the Hebrew Constitution. Those defining penalties are severe, as all cotemporary legislation was: but not more so, nor as much so, as most of the nations. Penal laws are an everlasting variation, and never long in any country an absolutely fixed quantity. These and the other special modifications of laws peculiar to that people are of course not obligatory upon us now, any more than they were upon cotemporaneous nations. But these, we have shown, are clearly distinguished from the ORGANIC LAW, the elementary principles of which run through a vast number of their local laws, unsuitable now even to the Hebrew people in detail; whilst their elements are common to all nations. In fact, our common law is largely borrowed from Moses; and so far as its moral elements are concerned, is all comprehended in the Decalogue. Thus the *Fourth* commandment stands on the rock of eternal truth. Like all the others, it was made for man, and was, therefore, by infinite wisdom, adapted to promote his welfare in time, as we shall see, and the sure grounds of his hopes for eternity.

For, obliterate the Sabbath, and you shut up the doors of knowledge and throw the pall of spiritual darkness around the race; shut out the light of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, and you leave the world a prey to infidelity and sin.

## CHAPTER XII.

OBJECTION—THE SABBATH WAS A SIGN TO ISRAEL, THEREFORE NOT A PERMANENT MORAL LAW.

Things well known are used as signs—Sun, moon, and stars—Rainbow—Circumcision—Stars and Stripes.

THIS objection is based on Exod. xxxi. 13–17, as already stated;—"For it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh he rested and was refreshed."

It is perhaps unnecessary to repeat here that the reason of the command "for in six days," etc., is a reason common to mankind, and is given in God's history of the creation, so often sneered at by opponents of the Sabbath. The reason has no especial reference to the Hebrew people: it is purely moral, and therefore everlasting—"for ever."

The point taken as an objection, is that it is a *sign between God and Israel;* therefore it could not have existed as a moral law from the beginning; (although this is expressly affirmed as the reason of it.) Because, say these objectors, God created the

heaven and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh, therefore he blessed the seventh and sanctified it to *Israel alone*, and that twenty-five centuries after creation! It could not be a *sign* to man, for whom the Sabbath was made, but is a *sign* to Israel, and proves that the reason given in the text is no reason at all! Obviously, the assumption here is that nothing could be a sign between parties covenanting, which had previously existed. How could the Divine example of six days' work and one of rest and refreshment be a sign or token of a covenant twenty-five hundred years after the example was set? Impossible! say these objectors; if it is a sign, and betokens a covenant, it must spring up simultaneously with the covenant itself, and this proves the Sabbath to be merely a Jewish institution, now for the first time established!

1. Remark, first. The Hebrew word, here translated *sign* occurs seventy-seven times in the Bible. The first, in Gen. i. 14, signifies the "lights in the firmament of the heaven,"—sun, moon and stars—"let them be for *signs*, and for seasons, and for days and for years." The second, Gen. iv. 15, "And the LORD set a *mark* upon Cain." The third, Gen. ix. 12, 17, "I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a *token* of a covenant between me and the earth. This is the *token* of the covenant."

2. Gen. xvii. "And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a *token* of the covenant betwixt me and you." Exod. iii. 12, and

iv. 8, it is applied to the miracles by which Moses is to prove his mission to lead Israel out of Egypt —"And this shall be a *token* unto thee"—"If they will not believe thee, neither hearken to the voice of the first *sign*, that they will believe the voice of the latter *sign*." It is applied to the miracles Moses wrought and is often translated *miracles*. He is directed, verse 17, "And thou shalt take this rod in thine hand, wherewith thou shalt do *signs*." And Num. xvii. 8, 10, this same "rod was budded, and brought forth buds, and bloomed blossoms and yielded almonds"—"Bring Aaron's rod again before the testimony to be kept for a *token* against the rebels." Exod. xii. 13, "And the blood shall be to you for a *token*"—Num. xiv. 22—"Which have seen the *miracles* which I have done."

Thus various are the uses of this word. A few words will suffice to sweep away the foundation of this argument against the antiquity and moral character of the Sabbatic law. The covenant with Noah had for its *sign* the bow in the cloud; therefore, says this argument, there never was any rainbow before the flood! But if the laws of nature are uniform, this inference is false and absurd. Whenever the sun and the cloud faced each other, there must have been a bow or a miracle to prevent it; for the laws of refraction and reflection of light exist in nature, and must always give a bow, whenever pencils of sunbeams fall upon the cloud. Now,

God appointed this uniformity in nature to a new and beautiful use;—made it henceforth a sign, an instrument of calling up to the recollection of Noah and mankind, the covenant guaranteeing summer and winter, seed time and harvest, as long as the earth endures, and protection against any future deluge. As therefore God's covenant with Noah and mankind made new and significant use of a phenomenon existing in nature from the beginning of the world; so precisely, God's covenant with Moses and Israel made a new and significant use of an institution established in the beginning as a sign of everlasting rest in heaven.

Again, God made a covenant with Abraham for himself and for a blessing to all mankind—for he is constituted the heir of the world—and this he confirmed—see Gen. xv. 9–15—by sacrifices and the bloody rite of circumcision, the former of which existed from the days of Eden. In like manner, the blood of sacrifice was used as a token—Exod. xii. 13—on the houses of the Israelites on the night of Egypt's sorrows. But the philosophy we oppose insists that nothing can be used for a sign or token, which is not itself a new thing.

Again, our Saviour says, "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision, (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers)" John vii. 22. But circumcision is the token of the covenant, as we have just seen, yet Moses repeated this. (Lev. xi. 3.) And Paul (Rom. iv. 11) tells us circumcision is the *sign* and seal of

the righteousness of faith—given by Moses four hundred years after it was given to Abraham. Therefore we conclude, that an institution, a matter, a thing may be appointed as a sign, which had existed long before.

Moreover, is not the eagle banner of the great Republic a *sign?* Are not the stars and stripes a *sign?* And did no eagle's wing cut the lofty ether before '76? Did no stars twinkle in the distant deep of the blue expanse, or stripes adorn the grass of the field, or the bow in the cloud before American patriot ladies embroidered the eagle banner, or stuck the stars on the blue, and stitched the stripes into a flag? The fact then, that in this municipal regulation, the Sabbatic institution is used as a sign of the covenant between God and Israel at Sinai, is no evidence at all of the non-existence of the constitutional law from the beginning, but the contrary rather. If two men, or two nations enter into a solemn covenant, do they append as the *sign* and seal thereof a mark, token, impression hitherto utterly unknown; or do they affix something previously well established and known? "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the *token* in every epistle: so I write." Had Paul no autograph before he wrote to the Thessalonians? of what use could his sign manual be, if it had never existed before? The wedding ring, is it not a token of undying affection? But is this proof that the ring

never existed before it was set up as a token of love? The fourth of July is a token; had there been no fourth prior to 1776? The Sabbath was a token to Israel; and is now a token to us, of heavenly rest.

# CHAPTER XIII.

## OBJECTIONS.

If you hold to the Sabbath, you must hold, 1. To its death penalty. —2. To the seventh day.—Seventh day, never used as a name for the day of sacred rest.—Sabbath day is never used, but as the name of time devoted to sacred rest.

It has been urged time after time, by way of objection, "If you hold to the Sabbath, you must take it with the penalty." We reply, it has no penalty as an organic law. As abundantly shown, the TEN WORDS, uttered from Sinai and written in stone, have no penalty. All the penalties are special enactments of municipal law. We hurl back the assertion: if you take the fifth precept, you must take the Jewish penalty and put to death the son who curseth father or mother. So of the woman who violates the law of the seventh commandment. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." So of the *first*, the *second*, the *third*, the *eighth*, the *ninth*—all *capital* penalties according to statute Mosaic; but without penalty according to organic law.

2dly. We reply, if you take the colonial law of Pennsylvania on the subject of theft, you must take it

with the penalty and punish larceny with death. The old laws prohibitory of theft, robbery, arson, burglary, blasphemy, perjury, forgery, and a hundred other wrong things, have been received and remain as laws, whilst in most, if not all instances, the penal sanctions have been modified. Manifestly, the whole plausibility and seeming force of this objection lies in the confounding of two things, in themselves entirely distinct—the law and moral rule immutable; and the penalty, which is ever variant.

Another popular objection involves the question of the day. If you hold to the Sabbath you must keep the seventh day. The error has already been noted, which mistakes Sabbath for seventh. Please Mr. Sabbath means *rest;* and when the LORD spake from Sinai, and wrote on stone, he did not say as you suppose, he blessed the *seventh* day and hallowed it, but the Sabbath day, and hallowed it. Now, in regard to time I have several remarks to make.

1. The phrase "seventh day" is never used in the Bible, as the name of the day of hallowed rest. This is a universal negative proposition, and can be proved only by examining all the places where this phrase occurs. It must be noted, that *seventh* is an ordinal number; that is, it implies the arranging of things in order, successively; first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, *seventh*, etc. It of course implies six things as going before it in order. It is therefore necessarily *descriptive;* it designates or points out the thing to which it is applied, relatively

to six or more other things, which follow each other in order of time or place or both. In fact, this is its precise use and only intent—to describe, designate, point out a thing as distinguished from all preceding. The streets of this city are numbered from the Delaware, first, second, third, etc.; and these ordinals have no other intent and use, but simply to describe the position and thus enable us to find the *place* we desire. Then we count the houses westward from the streets, first, second, seventh, for the same precise purpose. Now here, as in every possible use of ordinal numbers, there must be a starting-point—a point of departure, like the money unit in coinage, to which there is constant reference. We are now in the 1866th year from the birth of our Saviour, which is our chronological unit: and in the sixteenth day from a point of time immediately succeeding the 31st day of January. Now my assertion is, that this essential and inherent meaning of the word *seventh*, is found in all the forty-four times, wherein it occurs in the phrase *seventh-day:* and in every instance its purpose of defining and designating, depends on its unit of departure: the seventh day, from what? Unless this question is answered, it is no description at all. You tell me Mr. Smith lives at number seventh; can I find his house, unless I know from what point the count begins? It reminds me of the wisdom of numbering in New York, where adjoining streets, for example Fulton and Ann, running parallel,

count their numbers, one from East River, the other from Broadway.

The reader will assuredly excuse me from the labour of inspecting the whole forty-four cases in detail. I shall examine some, and give him reference to all the rest, that he may examine for himself. In Gen. ii., 2d and 3d verses, you have *seventh day* three times. Here the point of departure is distinctly marked—"the beginning," that is, of creation work. The creating acts of each day are enumerated, first, second, sixth, and at its close, creation work ceased, and on the seventh there was no creating energy put forth: rest, cessation from this form of action, characterized this day. God from Sinai giving the reason for the command,—Remember the Sabbath day, refers to this order. "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD thy God, for he rested on the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed, not the *seventh*, but the SABBATH day and hallowed it." *Seventh day*, in these five cases, is merely descriptive—not nominal—not giving the proper name.

In Exod. xii. 15, 16, describing the feast of unleavened bread, he directs that, on the first day, leaven shall be put away until the *seventh day*. These two instances have no necessary connection with the day of sacred rest. Chapter xiii. 6 is a repetition of the case. Chapter xvi. 26 describes the gathering of the manna: "Six days shall ye gather

it; but on the seventh day is the Sabbath." And verses 27 and 28 refer to the same. Chapter xxiv. 16: "And the cloud covered the Mount six days: and the seventh day he called unto Moses," etc.; no reference to the Sabbath. Chapter xxxi. 17 is a repetition of the reason as at the creation. Chapter xxxiv. 21 is the same; and so is xxxv. 2.

Lev. xxiii. 3 is a repetition of the reason. Verse 8 is in describing the feast of unleavened bread, and is parallel with Exod. xii. 15, 16. Lev. xiii. 5: The priest shall shut up the leper seven days, and "shall look on him the seventh day;" and this is repeated in verses 6, 27, 32, 34, 51; no one will claim these as the names of the Sabbatic rest. Chapter xiv. 9; "On the *seventh day* of his exclusion from his house because of leprosy, he shall shave his head," etc.; and in verse 39 the similar case. Num. vi. 9 is a case of shaving the head, etc. Num. xix. 12, it occurs twice in a case of purification. Chapter xxviii. 25: This is the case of extra feasts of unleavened bread. Chapter xxxi. 19, 24: This is a case of purification—"Purify both yourselves and your captives on the third day and on the seventh day." Deut. v. 14: This is the phraseology of the Fourth precept; and xvi. 8 is the feast of unleavened bread. Josh. vi. 4, 15: "On the *seventh day* they compassed the city seven times." Did the Lord order this on the Sabbath? Judg. xiv. 15, 17: "Within the seven days of the

wedding feast, a riddle was propounded, and this is the *seventh day* referred to. 2 Sam. xii. 18: "And it came to pass on the *seventh day*, that the child died"—*i. e.*, from the time "the Lord struck the child." 1 Kings xx. 29: "And they pitched one over against the other for seven days. And so it was, that on the *seventh day* the battle was joined;" that is, the seventh day from the time the two armies faced each other. The Jews would not fight on the Sabbath. Esther i. 10: On the seventh day [of the feast] when the heart of the king was merry with wine," etc. Was this a Sabbath? Ezek. xxx. 20: "Seventh day of the month;" xlv. 20: "And so shalt thou do the seventh day of the month." Heb. iv. 4: "And God did rest the seventh day from all his works."

The phrase, *Sabbath day*, occurs fourteen times in the Old; and twenty-two times in the New Testament: and there can be no question raised, as to whether it is applied as the distinctive name of the day of holy rest and religious worship. This is perfectly undeniable; and I need not trouble the reader with the detail. If he is very particular in having his foundations doubly sure, let him take Cruden and examine for himself. The word *Sabbath* as given in Cruden is read forty-one times in the Old, and fourteen times in the New Testament. In the plural—*Sabbaths*, it occurs in the Old Testament twenty-nine times and none at all in the New.

Of these eighty-four, as of the thirty-six occurrences of the phrase Sabbath day, there is no instance of its application to anything but to sacred rest—cessation from servile labour and consecration of time to religious worship.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### THE QUESTION OF TIME.

Evasion by it attempted—Remarks, 1. The same absolute portion impossible—2. Day begins? extra Sabbaths at even—3. The seventh, or the first day?—A voyage round the globe changes the day—4. The change of day to the first—Sunday, a name objectionable—William Penn on Lord's day.

WE hope the candid and attentive reader is convinced, by what we have said on the point of time, that the spirit of the law regards the *proportion*, rather than the *portion* absolute. One seventh part of our time, we are bound to withdraw from secular labours, physical and intellectual, and to appropriate and expend it in moral and religious culture, in the exercises of God's worship, private, but especially public, as being the chief means of improving our social nature.

It is one of the most ordinary arts of sophistry, when it cannot meet an argument directly and in front, to seek a side issue and lead attention away from the real point in debate. Apply to an avaricious man for a contribution for foreign missions, he directly becomes much concerned for the ignorant and neglected poor—the heathen at home. Ask

him to contribute to the Bible society, 'you better make clothing for the naked.' Press him to spend holy days in holy duties. Oh but you can't tell me what time is holy. You say the seventh part; he responds, but what part? One says the seventh day; another the first; and so he discards both and determines to keep all days holy, pursues his gains and refuses that rest which God requires and adapts to man's benefit.

On this question of time we remark,

1. The keeping holy of the same portion of absolute duration of time, by persons living in different latitudes and longitudes all round the globe, is a physical impossibility. There is no practicable method of measuring and thereby knowing it. When it is high noon with us, it is midnight with our antipodes; sunrise ninety degrees west, and sunset ninety degrees east of us. The same, identical time is therefore impossible to be kept holy; and the idea of God commanding a physical impossibility as a moral duty, cannot be entertained by any rational mind; and therefore the pretence of some affirming it, savours of irreverence, bordering on atheism. The Bible teaches no such doctrine. Its phraseology everywhere implies simply the appropriation of six days to secular pursuits; and another day, to be measured and ascertained precisely as each of the six is ascertained, to holy and sacred services. Practical difficulty here there is none. If there is intelligence enough to count six

units, and to add a seventh, nothing else lies in the way.

2. The question about the point at which the day begins, has no peculiar difficulty as to the Sabbath, more than any other of the seven. An ordinary day, counted and reckoned as other days, is to be observed as holy unto the Lord. We have before hinted the probable error arising from the extra Sabbath of atonement on the tenth day of the seventh month: Leviticus xxiii. 27–32. This and the feast of the Passover and the feast of unleavened bread, Exodus xii. 6, 18, are special Sabbaths—annual feasts peculiar to the Hebrew nation, resulting from the Decalogue as their root, but not of it, as permanent organic law. The Passover-lamb was slain in the evening—or, as in the margin correctly translated—"between the evenings;" that is, about three o'clock afternoon, when the sun was half-way declined; and about this time the evening sacrifice was offered: by both of which was prefigured, Christ's being crucified for us in the last part of the age of the world, and his dying at that time of the day." However this may be, certain it is, the typical Passover-lamb was slain in the *evening;* and about midnight the first-born of Egypt were stricken down and there was a great cry. "And Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron by night—and they were thrust out of Egypt." It is also certain that the feast of unleavened bread began in the *evening* of the fourteenth day of the

first month, and continued until the one and twentieth day of the month at *even.*" The reasons lie open and obvious. And this, doubtless, led to the designation of the same time for the reckoning of the extra Sabbath of the atonement. Leviticus xxiii. 32, "It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls in the ninth day of the month at even: from even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." As these are extra Sabbaths—Jewish institutions and contra-distinguished, for obvious reasons, as *your* Sabbaths, with *my* Sabbaths—the Sabbaths of the Lord; there is no just ground here for the inference, that the ordinary weekly rest began in the evening. On the contrary, as this modification, "from evening unto evening shall ye *Sabbath* your *Sabbath*,"—shall ye *rest* your *rest*—"shall ye celebrate your Sabbath," is appended to these extra Jewish days of rest, and to no others, the inference rather is, that these annual days of rest are exceptional as to the time of beginning them. What is a day? If this be settled in regard to the second, the fifth, the other days of the seven, then it is decided as to the seventh also. If an ordinary day properly begins at 12 M., then must the day of rest begin at high noon; how impracticable this would be all can see at once. If a day begins at six P. M. or at sundown, how impracticable and how often attended with retrenchment upon holy time? The farmer goes to the mill or blacksmith-shop on Saturday after-

noon, expecting to return before sundown and to do up his business before the Sabbath hour begins; he has no watch, it is cloudy, or the water is low and the mill grinds slowly; he is delayed and thus is betrayed into intrenchment upon sacred time. Such beginning of the holy day is impracticable. For an *annual* festival, to continue several days, a more formal preparation, as is required for historical reminiscence, obviates these difficulties, which lead to continually recurring infractions of the Sabbatic law. But if the day begins, at an hour when all working-men, and beasts, too, are asleep, there is no room for such interruptions, and no difficulty in marking minutes: the conscientious man is ever anxious, lest, under disappointment that delays him, or the cloud that hides the sun as it nears the western horizon, he may transgress the law.

Such rational considerations seem to call for the beginning of the day, at the central point between sun-set and sun-rise. And this deduction of reason from the book of nature, and the book of experience, corresponds with the book of revelation.

Webster says of our leading connective "And," "It signifies that a word or part of a sentence is to be added to what precedes." Darkness preceded light: "Darkness was upon the face of the deep:" this is followed by the creation of light; and so, the evening was *and* the morning *added*, made one day. No certain inference can be however deduced, as

to the dividing point of time between the days. There is something more distinct at the rising of the Sun of Righteousness. Matt. xxviii. 1, "In the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary," etc. The word rendered "end," occurs but twice more in the New Testament. Mark xi. 19, "And when *even* was come, he went out of the city;" xiii. 35, "For ye know not when the Master of the house cometh, at *even*, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning." At a late period of the Sabbath—or of the week as it was dawning toward the first of the Sabbaths. Whether the plurals here mean, the two Sabbaths—the Hebrew and the Christian, as confining, or only as translated, the *week*, it is not necessary for our present purpose to determine; we are concerned with the expression, *began to dawn*. As the rays of the sun began to approach the eastern horizon, the Marys, having made all necessary preparations, on their preparation or day before their Sabbath, left their homes at its close, and by the time they reached the sepulchre, it was early dawn. The expression intimates the turning point, when the rays were thrown chiefly from the east and met them at the tomb. This was "very early in the morning" of the first day. Luke xxiv. 1. The crucifixion occurred on what we call Friday, at nine o'clock A. M. Mark xv. 25: at twelve darkness came on, until three P. M., verse 33. Shortly after he cried with a loud voice and gave up the

ghost. He was therefore six hours and more on the cross before his death; of which three were shrouded with darkness over the whole land: there remained nine hours of the day before the Sabbath, as we contend; that is before the day began to dawn toward the Sabbath: these nine hours, and the whole of the Sabbath, and the six hours from the dawning toward the first day, his body remained in the tomb. But if the day begins at sundown; as it was the vernal equinox, there would be less than three hours between the death and the end of that preparation day, which we would call Saturday. During these three hours the Jews must go back to the city and get an order for breaking the legs of the three, return and proceed to execute the order; Joseph after this has to return and beg the body from Pilate; Pilate, doubting the fact of Christ's death, had to send for the centurion and ask him whether he had been any while dead, and when he knew that he had been dead some little while, he gave the body to Joseph, who returned and buried it. Now for all these transactions there were less than three hours. Whatever of the three remained, if any was possible, was all we have to fulfil his own declaration that "the Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. xii. 40. But if we account the dividing of days to be at midnight, then we have part of the day and night of our Friday, the whole of the day and night of our Saturday, and part of the day and

night of our Sunday: and thus the conditions of the prophecy are fulfilled. These considerations, together with the silence of Scripture, satisfy us, that to begin the holy weekly Sabbath at sundown is a Jewish figment, occasioned by their magnifying their own special feasts above the LORD'S Sabbaths.

3. Our third question of time is, as to the seventh or the first. Confessedly of trifling importance, yet it is controverted with no trifling zeal—we may say violence. In this we have verification of the uncomplimentary remark, that theological disputes are often warm and excited, inversely as their importance. As there is not matter in them worthy of controversy, the little that is is lost sight of, and in the contest victory supplants truth: and whoever fights simply for victory, forfeits all just claims to success. Truth, which alone is worth contending for, repudiates such defenders.

We are told, if you take the Sabbath, you must take the seventh day. We answer, this is a *non sequitur;* and for several reasons. (1.) The seventh must mean, in this objection, the seventh from the beginning of creation; that is, the start-point; and we affirm the impossibility of ascertaining the knowledge of it. No man can now affirm that our Saturday is the exact time in an unvarying seventh day's division from the genesis of light. This utter impossibility excludes the idea from the field of morality. (2.) If we fix the start-point of the count on Tuesday, and call that *first day*, we shall

call Sunday *seventh day*. And this could be insured in individual cases by a little artifice. Suppose you hold a sponge saturated with mesmeric power to the nose of a seventh day advocate, or lay him up in sleep, by any opiate, for a whole day; when he awakes to consciousness, having lost a day out of his count, his seventh will be Sunday. (3.) A voyage round the world changes the day; westward losing one, and eastward gaining one. That is, the westward voyager adds to the length of each day he travels, the distance, measured by time, of his day's journey; whilst the eastward voyager, by meeting the sun sooner each day, diminishes his day's length by the distance he travels. This will be made evident by the following statement from the pen of a distinguished professor of astronomy:

"The difference in local time, caused by difference of longitude, is a familiar fact. Any one who has travelled from New York to St. Louis must have noticed that his watch, though correct when he left the former city, is more than an hour too fast by the local time of the latter. The explanation, too, is simple. Owing to the diurnal rotation of the earth on its axis, the sun appears to make a circuit round the earth from east to west every day; *i. e.*, 360° in 24 hours. Hence its apparent motion each hour is 15°. And as St. Louis is more than 15° west of New York, more than an hour must elapse after the sun passes the meridian of the latter, before it reaches that of the former.

Suppose, now, a Jew and a Christian, starting from the city of Washington to travel in opposite directions,—the Jew going west, and the Christian east, each at the rate of 15° per week,—and suppose they commence their reckoning at six o'clock on Sunday morning, by Washington time. At the expiration of one week, when it is again six o'clock A. M. on Sunday at Washington, the Jew will be in Missouri, and his local time five o'clock A. M; while to the Christian, out at sea, the time will be seven o'clock A. M. In like manner, after another week, the time by the former will be four o'clock A. M., and by the latter eight A. M., and so on, the Jew's time growing earlier, and the Christian's later, by one hour each week, till, at the expiration of twelve weeks, they meet in northwestern China, the Jew pronouncing the time to be six o'clock P. M. on Saturday, and the Christian six P. M. on Sunday, and each will have observed the Sabbath on the same day."

What a cheap method of uniting a divided church! Two sects of Baptists, for example, exist. The smaller section separate from the great body, on the ground that the seventh day is the true Sabbath. No religious principle is involved—no doctrine, but only this question of *time*—not the *proportion*, for both agree in the obligation to keep one day in seven holy unto the Lord; but simply whether our Saturday or our Sunday is the proper day to be kept holy. Now let the Saturday man go to Cali-

fornia, and then to China, and then home by the Cape of Good Hope, keeping his own seventh day rest all the time, and the dispute is over—he worships with his brethren on Sunday. The Baptist schism is healed—the church is one!

4. The change of the name and day—not of the thing, for the observance of the holy day is the same with all Christians: but on what ground do we vindicate the Sunday as the day of sacred rest? We admit that any other day, Tuesday, Thursday, if agreed upon over the whole country and the world, would answer as well. We deny any holiness in time: the thought is absurd. The holiness lies in the heart of the worshippers. With the unbelieving world, Sunday is the most polluted of all days. In all popish governed countries, their Sabbath is the devil's day. The interests of Satan's kingdom are more abundantly advanced on that day than on any one of the seven. But some day is indispensable. This must be agreed upon, or public worship is impracticable. Instead, however, of leaving man to settle this question by experiment and consultation, conventional adjustment and agreement, God was pleased to decide it for us. The first law he gave to man was the Sabbatic law—the day following the six days' labour is sacred to God by his own command. In imitation of the Creator's own example, he has given us also the glorious and blessed privilege of resting, and worshipping himself. And Paul tells us, God the Son, in imitation of God the

Creator, when he had said, "It is finished," bowed his head, and gave up the ghost, and entered into his rest. "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." Paul had just said, "There remaineth therefore a Sabbatismos for the people of God." Heb. iv. 10, 9. Christ's finishing his work, for the salvation of lost men, is followed by his entering into his rest and securing a Sabbatismos for his people. Thus the creation-example is imitated; and this is a most satisfactory reason of the change. Jesus rose from the dead and went to his heavenly glory, and thus consecrated the first day to holy services. His Church obeyed his command and followed his example. Let us note the occasions.

(1.) The first has been mentioned above. The pious women came to the sepulchre very early on the first day of the week: they came to do honour to a dead, but found a living Saviour.

(2.) "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut when the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John xx. 19. The law being changed the day must also be changed; and here is the express sanction of it. The disciples were assembled: and for what? No man can doubt —for religious worship. And the Master enters by miracle, giving a new proof of his divine mission and power.

(3.) "And after eight days, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." This second time, He meets them on the first day of the week, in order to designate it as the Sabbatism of the new covenant and to run out the parallel between the first and the second creation or work of redemption. At the close of this work, which is "creation more sublime," there must be a rest physical, that is, a cessation of that work; just as there was at the first creation: and then there must be, as at first, a rest in the higher sense, viz., the delight and complacency resulting from the contemplation of his finished work, all which he pronounced "very good;" or as Moses, Exod. xxxi. 17, expresses it, "and was refreshed." So Christ, having finished his new creation-work, entered into his rest in the higher sense; to contemplate and for ever rejoice in the results of his work, from the manger at Bethlehem to the tomb of Joseph. "There remaineth therefore a Sabbatismos to the people of God." And then Paul adds the reason, in the parallel to which we have just referred. "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." Thus the apostle demonstrates, from old Testament authorities, the change of the Sabbatic rest for the New. And several notices of its observance are recorded. Acts xx. 7, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples

came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow." Here is not a special call of the people, but it is mentioned as an ordinary occurrence—a regular thing. A more rigidly close rendering strengthens this idea—it is the case absolute—"the disciples being assembled together." A similar incidental remark occurs in 1 Cor. xvi. 2, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered, that there be no gatherings when I come." The order regards "the collection for the saints," a duty which he had urged upon the Galatian church. Chap. vi. 7–10. It is enjoined as a regular service. The churches of Galatia were so *ordered*—it was obligatory upon them. The church at Troas, in Asia Minor, were in the habit of assembling on the first day. And the churches at Corinth —I say churches; for though the epistle is addressed "to the church of God which is at Corinth," that church included many congregations or particular churches, Acts xviii. 10, "I have much people in this city," and the churches of Galatia met constantly on the first day of the week, and that by apostolic command and example. But if we translate the phrase as the same word is translated, in Luke xvi. 19—*every* day—or even, as in Mat. xxvi. 55, Mark xiv. 49, Luke xix. 47, and xxii. 53, Acts ii. 47, and iii. 1, and xviii. 4, and xix. 9—*daily*—it indicates still more strongly their *habit* of meeting *every* first day for religious worship.

Let us sum up these evidences of the Sabbatismos for the New Testament or covenant. Paul demonstrates it in Heb. iv.—that so it must be according to the Old Testament Scriptures, and according to the very nature of Christ's work of the new creation. Accordingly Jesus arose on the first day—the day immediately after the finishing of his work. He manifested himself to the Marys. He met the disciples on the first day; once and again: and he met them for worship on no other day. Individuals saw him possibly on other days, but of this there is no certainty. "He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once," 1 Cor. xv. 6, but at what time we are not informed; the probability is however all on the side of the first day, when they were assembled for worship. Then the sacramental service at Troas, the order for collection on the first day by churches, at Corinth, and in Galatia—churches widely separated. To all this must be added the invariable practice of the church for more than fifteen centuries during which no dispute arose against this practice. Jewish converts embraced the law, and to a large extent, even when respecting the seventh day, fell in with the general custom. This suggests the additional remark that, this change to the Lord's day, diminished not, but increased the measure and proportion of time devoted to sacred uses. Two Sabbaths came together; and it is abundantly evident, that Paul and his companions on his missions, were in the habit of entering the Syna-

gogues on the Sabbaths, and reasoning out of the Scriptures: and thus the required transition, by tolerating both days for a time, became easy and produced no confusion.

Nor may we omit the proof from Rev. i. 10: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." This was about A. D. 95. It is the last of the inspired writings, and this accounts for the fact that this name —the *Lord's day*—is found here and nowhere else. Surviving the other inspired penmen by a quarter of a century, by which time the habits of all Christian churches became settled in their public worship on the first, and with the well-known reason for the change from the Jewish seventh day Sabbath to the first, John adopts this phrase, *the Lord's day*, without the least hint explanatory. I was in the Spirit —under the supernatural influences of the Holy Ghost—on *the Lord's day*. This is proof conclusive that the phrase was perfectly understood at that time. John had been banished by the edict of the Emperor Domitian to "Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Cut off from Christian associations, he was honoured with the Divine presence; and in entering up the record of his visions and messages, he honours his Lord by using an expression which could give no information of date, but as it was the well-known epithet for the day of sacred rest. Sixty-one years before this, the Lord had twice met John, along with the other disciples, on the first day

of the week, in that upper room, the doors being shut for fear of the Jews; and now he meets him in banishment to a desert island, and John records the day—*his Lord's day*. In their contest with popery, the Reformers rejected the numerous festal days of the Romish calendar, and Luther especially was fierce against them. Hence some ill-informed people assume that he rejected the Sabbath too: this is not true. He did deny indeed the Jewish Sabbaths as simply Jewish—denying that Hebrew legislation binds us any farther than the Decalogue extends. He rejected all feast days, "*nisi dies Dominicus—except the Lord's day.*"

Sunday is a name objectionable, because it implies that we worship the Sun, and have devoted this day to his service. The same objection applies to our names for the other days. They are all borrowed from our pagan ancestors, being the names of their imaginary gods, prefixed to the word *day:* Monday, appropriated to the worship of the moon; Tuesday, to Tuis, or the war god of our ancestors; Wednesday, to Wodin; Thursday, to Thor, the god of thunder; Friday, to the goddess Frigga, or Frea; Saturday, to Saturn. The objections made by the Friends, or Quaker society, to these names, are not, in our judgment, frivolous. David says of the heathen gods—"Their drink-offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their names into my lips." Ps. xvi. 4. And Zech. xiii. 2: "I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land." I know it

may be said, this only means they shall not dwell on our lips as objects of worship. Still, it is to be regretted that we have not better names for the days respectively; and I cannot but respect the founder of Pennsylvania for the introduction of the more respectful epithets into the very first act of legislation in his province.

I quote from an able report of a committee in the Legislature, in A. D. 1860, on the petitions for the abrogation of the Sabbath protecting laws:

"In the 'GREAT LAW,' passed in the Assembly at Chester, soon after his first landing, December 12, 1682, William Penn has recorded his estimation of the Sabbath as one of the main safeguards of civil and religious liberty. In the first article of this code, the design of which is declared to be,—'That God may have his due, Cæsar his due, and the people their due, so that the best and firmest foundation may be laid for the present and future happiness of both the government and the people of this province,' he thus ordains:—'To the end that looseness, irreligion, and atheism may not creep in under the pretence of conscience in this province, be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that according to the good example of the primitive Christians, and for the ease of the creation, every *first* day of the week, called the LORD'S DAY, people shall abstain from their common toil and labour, that whether masters, parents, children, or servants, they may the better dispose themselves to read the

Scriptures of truth at home, or to frequent such meetings of religious worship abroad as may best suit their respective persuasions.'" (Hazzard's Annals.)

He does not use the word Sabbath, nor the word Sunday; but "*first day of the week* and THE LORD'S DAY," both Scriptural epithets. So let it stand.

## CHAPTER XV.

### BENEFITS OF THE SABBATH.

THESE may be considered in reference to man individually, and to man socially: and in both these respects, as to its bearing upon his physical condition; and upon his intellectual, his moral, and his spiritual interests; for time and for eternity.

I. How is the individual benefited *physically* by the Sabbath? By rest, in the primary sense—cessation from motion—from activity—from labour. The Creator has so formed us, that incessant activity must destroy the powers of action and bring to an end the organism of our body. Death and utter dissolution is the inevitable consequence of labour without rest: and thus, the denial of rest, eventuates in entire incompetency for motion and labour. God's law is, that man shall have rest; as William Penn expresses it, "for the ease of the creation." Adapted to this is the arrangement of day and night; sleep is a necessity to man, and darkness, though not necessary to sleep, yet is a great promoter of it; whilst light, as a positive element in nature, by its power to stimulate, tends to wakefulness and action. But the Creator has seen proper

to make not one rest in the circuit of the sun, sufficient. Day and night shall be as long as the earth endures, but additional to this, total abstinence from labour one-seventh part of the time, is made a privilege.

2. The necessary consequence of cessation from work is resuscitation of the exhausted powers. A recuperative action of the vital functions follows, and "Tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep" has great assistance in her office of benevolence, from effects of the seventh part of working time being similarly appropriated. Into the argument for a seventh day rest, deduced from multitudinous experiments on animal nature in man and beast, we cannot even enter. Thousands of experiments have shown, that the man or the beast of burden, which rests one day in seven, can do, and actually does, more labour than the beast or the man that works seven days in the week. God's will, revealed in his moral law, is perfectly consistent with his will revealed in his physical laws. They are counterparts of the same infinite wisdom.

3. By necessary consequence, the health of our animal frame is promoted by this law. Why it must be so, is easily seen. Exhaustion is disease; it reveals the weaker parts of our bodily mechanism and tends to their destruction; which tendency is arrested by rest and resuscitation. But detail here is also inconsistent with our limited plan. The world all knows, that a Sabbath-keeping commu-

nity, other things being equal, is more healthy than one that disregards the Sabbatic law.

4. And this, because this law leads to personal cleanliness. The alliance is intimate and insolvable between natural and moral filth: and the Sabbath, by calling to religious social exercises and enjoyments, prompts and constrains to a change of the soiled garments of labour, for the clean and neat dress of social Christianity. This is obvious even in communities where the holy day is greatly prostituted to sports and plays. This purifying influence of a seventh day's rest, is proverbial in the phrase, *Sunday clothes*. We might also have remarked under the preceding, that the greatly increased calls for medicine and counsel, on Sunday, in a labouring population, shows that labour looks to this day for health. The fact is not complimentary to the Christian reverence for the day; yet it evinces its tendency.

Now, these four remarks, being generalized, show the physical benefits to society, which is composed of individuals: the aggregate benefits are the sum of social benefits. When every person is eased, refreshed, and has health promoted, and cleanliness secured, society is thus benefited.

II. The intellect of the individual observer of the Sabbath is necessarily improved. Religious exercises and devotion, whether private or public, are impossible—indeed, inconceivable, without mental activity. Religion is possible only with intelligent

beings, endowed with a moral sense: and this moral sense even, though an essential power of our nature, yet is dependent for its possibility of exercise, upon intellect. I mean that the moral sense, that is, *conscience* includes and presupposes, mental perceptions—intellectual exercises. I cannot convict myself of wrong-doing and feel abased and humbled for my sin, unless I have an intelligent idea of some law that I have violated. All the religious duties of the individual therefore call into action his mental powers upon lawful objects: and here, as everywhere, all legitimate activities increase the powers of action. The mind improves by its own right activities. What a school then we have here? One-seventh part of our time, sacredly devoted to such services as necessarily increase our powers of mind and enlarge the sphere of our knowledge.

III. But an all important item of Sabbatic observance, is, its provision for instruction; for the presentation of truth to the mind and its discussion, analysis and application to the various conditions and necessities of individuals and society. The Sabbath is not a day of inaction—of stupid idleness, but for the full action of our higher nature. It provides subjects of study. It furnishes aids to mental development—the whole system of sacred ordinances; including the Scriptures and all their varied instructions; and the ministry of religion and the sacramental services. "The priest's lips should keep knowledge and they should learn the

law at his mouth." There never has been a system for mental improvement comparable to this. Here is the Book of universal instruction; and here is an order of men set apart to its study, their lives being devoted to its exposition: men of good natural talents and of the best education. These men spend six days in searching the Scriptures and studying the condition and necessities of the community; and on the seventh they communicate to the people the results of their labour. Under this system of teaching the understanding cannot but be furnished with knowledge of all kinds, for the Bible contains the elements of all knowledge; and the reasoning powers must necessarily be increased, for the preacher must "reason out of the Scriptures." Accordingly, the general intelligence of a nation is very accurately measured by the degree of its strictness in Sabbatic observance. The man of seventy has been ten years at school, under direction of the best cultivated intellects of his country; and if he arrive not at a respectable degree of intelligence, it must be owing to sad neglect on his own part.

IV. But intellectual culture is an incident, rather than an object. The end of the Sabbath, is our moral and spiritual improvement; and the glory of God its ordainer. Man's religious element is brought into action and directed to its proper end. Between the soul and God the intercourse, common through the week, is redoubled and that of the in-

dividual is carried on the Sabbath into the social current and thus a feeling of unity is generated and enlarged. The benevolent affections are cherished under the deeper feelings of religious reverence. The doctrines taught lead to unity of heart; for all the members of that one body which Christ hath redeemed with his own blood, are constantly led to contemplate the oneness of their interest in the great salvation. Thus, that charity which is the bond of perfectness cements society together and ensures that unity of co-operation, so important to the harmonious movement of our social system.

V. But the bearings of all these influences upon the interests of eternity are in themselves of infinite value; and in their reaction upon our social feelings in time, their importance can scarcely be appreciated. To be brought squarely up to face the responsibilities of our condition once a week; to inquire, whence came I? whither go I? how can I prepare for my duties here and my felicities in the future world? How far am I responsible for the welfare of all these with whom I am associated and surrounded daily? Shall I ever meet them again in time? How shall I meet them in eternity? All such thoughts have a happy influence upon us, in checking wrong feelings and gendering and directing the action of right ones.

## CHAPTER XVI.

### THE MORAL FORCE OF THE SABBATH, AND ITS BEARINGS ON NATIONAL WEALTH.

WHEREVER the TEN WORDS are continually held up before the minds and pressed upon the hearts of a whole people; and wherever, in immediate connection with them, the glorious gospel of the blessed God is constantly unfolded before their minds; and thus the way of meeting the high requirements of the Decalogue, is made familiar to the popular conscience; it is not possible the public morals should not improve and reach a high degree of excellence. The pure elements of moral law; and the purifying doctrines of salvation—from the guilt and pollution of sin, constitute the most perfect agencies and instrumentalities, which the God of all mercies has ever furnished to a ruined world, for its recovery. Now, these are the invariable accompaniments of the sacred rest day. Evangelical Protestantism cannot exist, without a day devoted to moral and religious instruction and the reverent worship of the living God. The word of God must be read and expounded, the praises of the Most High must be made to ring in loud tones from millions of

tongues; the voice of prayer must ascend from millions of sanctified hearts; the pure doctrines of the Holy Bible must be inculcated upon the myriads of youthful minds, which with thrilling emotion and voice, sing "let us be joyful"—"we must not work, we must not play, because it is the Sabbath day." These instrumentalities, being the substance of Sabbath duties, can no more exist without great practical effects in promoting good morals, than the rain of heaven and the genial warmth of the sun, can spread over the well tilled fields, without causing the grass and the grain to spring forth for the benefit of man and of beast. A Sabbath-keeping —a church-going people, spending the day as the law itself requires, must necessarily be a moral people. A Sabbath-profaning people: even where a small part of the day is occupied in attendance upon religious ceremonies, performed chiefly in a language which they do not understand, but where the day is chiefly devoted to sports, pleasures and pastimes; dissipation, fun and frolic, cannot possibly be a moral and law-abiding people; if order is duly observed, it must be at the bayonet's point. Accordingly there is a striking contrast between countries where the different systems prevail.

We may take in here the *bearings of the Sabbath on national wealth.*

"To the Sabbath," says Gilfillan, p. 249, "did England in no small degree owe a government so puissant and beneficial as that of Cromwell, the

happy domestic influence of which is admitted by Bishop Burnet, while its foreign aspect is eulogized by a no less unbiassed judge, Sir Walter Scott, who says, "Perhaps no government was ever more respected abroad." To the Sabbath, as a principal cause, was Britain indebted for such a reign as that of William III., Prince of Orange, and for the superiority of our present Constitution to the governments of Russia, France, and Italy, where the people are in chains, which the expansive spirit of a nation imbued with the influence of Christian truth and institutions, if we could suppose it thus fettered, would calmly break in pieces. The policy of those rulers, who amuse their subjects with frivolous objects on the Lord's day, that they may not by serious thought be led to discover that they are men, and deeply injured men, may be cunning and successful for a time, but it is not wise, since its purpose is as short-sighted as it is unjust. The convulsions on the continent in 1848 furnished impressive illustrations of this truth. It is a fact, that these convulsions were more destructive in Roman Catholic kingdoms, where there was nothing entitled to the name of a Sabbath, than in Protestant communities, where the institution, inasmuch as it brought along with it the opportunities of a more rational worship and of better instruction, had not suffered so much deterioration. No Protestant prince lost his throne. And it is especially worthy of grateful remembrance, that Great Britain, where,

above almost all countries, the Lord's day receives its meed, though far from its due meed of honour, stood firm and unscathed in all its interests amidst the shakings of the nations of Europe. "I see," says the Chevalier Bunsen, personating Hippolytus, "that you have erected most wonderful factories and cotton mills; but you do not make the poor people, men, women, and children, work them on Sundays, as the Gauls [the French] do in their country." On p. 250 he says: "In Scotland, eighteen hundred soldiers suffice to keep the peace, while Ireland required, for the eight years preceding 1852, troops numbering, at an average, more than twenty-five thousand." What says M. Montalembert, in the name of a commission reporting to the French Parliament in 1850 on Sabbath observance? After remarking that the Almighty conferred success and security on human labour in proportion as nations respect the Lord's day, he refers in proof to England and the United States, and says: "Witness that city, London, the capital and focus of the commerce of the world, where Sunday is observed with the most scrupulous care, and where two and a half millions of people are kept in order by three battalions of infantry, and some troops of guards, whilst Paris requires the presence of fifty thousand men." Such is the expense of irreligion and the loss of the Sabbath. But how was it in the days of atheism and blood; when God's holy day was abrogated, and a tenth day festival established by

the Constituent Assembly, in lieu of the Sabbath; and the worship of a harlot, in place of God's sacred ordinances? So must it be in any country that abolishes the Divine law of the two tables. Brute force must then rule, and the very conception of liberty be lost. "He that makes haste to be rich shall not be unpunished;" and if, in our eagerness to make money, we abrogate the law of the Sabbath, we shall find its sanctions terrible as Israel found them. "As the partridge sitteth on eggs and hatcheth them not; so he that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his days, and at his end, shall be a fool." Jere. xvii. 11. And verse 24: "If ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath day, to do no work therein; then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes, sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and this city shall remain for ever." Verse 27: "But if ye will not hearken unto me, to hallow the Sabbath day, and not bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." This solemn warning was unheeded, and the prophet was even grossly maltreated for its delivery: nevertheless, the wrath of heaven

came speedily; Israel was terribly scourged and carried away into Babylon. Neh. xiii. 15: "In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine-presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: and I testified against them, in the day wherein they sold victuals." Verse 16: "There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah, and in Jerusalem." 17: "Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath day?" Verse 18: "Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon our city? Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath?"

Ezek. also, xxi. 8, 26, mentions among the great sins of the people, that they "have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them." Observe. 1. We thus learn, that Sabbath-breaking was a leading cause of the Babylonish captivity. 2. We learn farther, that foreign traders were largely instrumental in this corruption: precisely as it is now with us in these United States. It is chiefly, imported atheism and low dealers that give life to the assaults upon our Sabbatic laws and the religious foundations of our morality. 3. Even within the sphere of agricultural necessity—so alleged, the

gathering of the crops, is a sin against God on the holy day of rest. 4. Officers of the law sin; in winking at this sin; "have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths." Sunday papers are hawked along our streets on the Lord's day and our public servants don't see it. 5. And Oh, how many fires has God kindled up all over the land and the water: what bursting of boilers; runnings off the track; collisions of locomotives and cars; burning of depots, bridges, stores and dwellings. All these are visitations from God and largely in punishment of Sabbath-breaking. 6. We learn too the philosophy of this class of things. Employers disregard the law of God: they force their employees to work on Sunday or lose their places: their consciences revolt at first, but soon become blunted—seared as with a hot iron. But conscience polluted in reference to one part of God's law, cannot possibly continue long pure in reference to other points. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all," James ii. 10. And the reason is obvious—the law of God is a unit—it is his will revealed as a rule of action to his creatures: resistance to his will in anything, shows a heart at enmity with him. 7. Thus, corporations which boast that they have no souls, expel the souls from the bodies of their employees—for when a man has no conscience, he has only the soul of a brute; then, the leprosy of conscienceless sin spreads over the whole inner man and no moral element can bind him.

Hence these terrible disasters. They are the Babylonish captivity of God's curse—"Ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath;" and this "fire shall not be quenched." There is God's sentence; let Sabbath-breakers read it: especially let monied corporations which profane the Sabbath by their agents and let all stockholders in such corporations—read God's sentence upon their wicked business and fear before Jeremiah's message.

If God's veracity can be relied on, the Sabbath-keeping nation must be prosperous and happy, even in a worldly sense. "Thou shalt ride upon the high places of the earth, and I will feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." It is most unreasonable to expect that success will permanently attend robbery. The man or people who rob God of his holy day, may look for the frown of his disapprobation. Pharaoh's fate, brought on him by his cruelty and oppression in destroying the Israelites' Sabbath, ought to be a salutary warning. Disasters must, by the necessity of an abused conscience and dissipated habits enfeebling the powers employed in labour, paralyze effort and diminish production. Steamers on our western waters, blow up of course, nothing else is looked for; but the philosophy that traces most of these terrible visitations to want of conscience, is not well understood and but little studied. Gilfillan and Montalembert refer to England for illustration; but with all our short-comings

in this behalf, the United States are still the most strict nation in the observance of the holy day: and for this very reason the most prosperous people on the face of the earth. No nation has ever moved onward, in everything that belongs to civilization, with such amazing rapidity. Our wealth and resources are inexhaustible, and their development is largely owing to the lofty tone of our national morality. And, as observed before, the measure of this morality is in exact proportion to our Sabbath observance. Thus we reach a standard of admeasurement, by theory; which fails never, when brought to the test of experiment. Nations are prosperous, great and happy and influential for good, the world over, just in proportion as they remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy.

## CHAPTER XVII.

### KEEP IT HOLY TO THE LORD.

Negatively—Positively—Cessation from business—Sports, plays, pleasures—Quibbles—Necessity and mercy—Necessities numerous—Feigned—Positive—Private—Public.

It has been already noted that holiness, in the sense of moral excellence, no more than blessedness, in the sense of happiness, is not imputable to time. The conception is absurd. Both these belong only to moral agents, who only are capable of moral purity and felicity. When, therefore, the Sabbath day is blessed and sanctified, the meaning is, that it is made and appointed for a blessing to man, by being set apart to resting from worldly labours, and consecrated or devoted to the holy service of God.

By keeping it holy to God *negatively*, we simply mean cessation from secular or worldly business. "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work" —or *business*—complete thy mission. "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Now, if a man's "business" lies in physical or bodily labour, there must be a suspension of his toil: if his "business" —his worldly avocation—consists of intellectual ex-

ertion, this is to be suspended; or if his "business" include both kinds of work intermixed, then both forms of exertion must cease. Thus provision is made for the relief of both mind and body: and this for one seventh part of the time. Detail as to kinds of business is not consistent with the nature of *organic law*. To enumerate all the kinds of both forms, or either form of labour, in which men in all ages may be engaged, is impossible. Most silly would it be for a ploughman to say, The fourth precept don't forbid ploughing; a blacksmith, It does not forbid making axes or shoeing horses; a carter, It does not forbid hauling brick; a printer, There is no prohibition of printing; a lawyer, There is nothing expressly against legal research on the Sabbath. Against such absurdity, the wording of this part of the Hebrew Constitution is a prophylactic remedy. The original word, translated "work," does not mean simply labour of mind or body, or both, but "business,"—*avocation*, *trade*, *pursuit*, *employment*. It is often translated "workmanship" —as in Exod. xxxi. 3, 5. Whatever be a man's employment during the six days is to be suspended on the seventh; and this, so far, makes it a Sabbath.

But the law equally prohibits meditation, and study, and the outgo of desire after his business on the holy day; for this interferes with other parts of the consecration.

It also cuts off pleasures, sports, and plays,—all

mere amusements. The evangelical prophet gives us a clue to this exposition. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, *from* doing thy pleasure on my holy day, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." Isa. lviii. 13. And this exposition is indispensable to the very end of the institution, which is to honour God by spending the day in his holy service.

These remarks, though brief, are sufficient to shut off the miserable quibbles, sometimes thrown out, about not feeding cattle, cooking victuals, riding or walking to church. "Thou shalt not do any work," say these champions of reason, as an adequate guide in duty, therefore a man must not wash his hands, put on his clothes, lead his horse to water, feed him, saddle or harness him and ride to church! Whilst the *work* prohibited is the ordinary "business" of the six days, and not at all any of the works of necessity or mercy, for which this phraseology of the law fully provides. And this is the popularly received interpretation. When the Church or the nation appoints a day of fasting and prayer, or of thanksgiving and praise, they consecrate and observe it by a suspension of all "business," and a resort to the sanctuary for religious worship.

This provision for works of necessity and mercy, inherent in the organic law, is developed in subsequent legislation; and our Saviour rebukes the querulous pharisees for their perversity and ignorance: "What

man shall there be among you that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." Matt. xii. 11: "Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you, on the Sabbath, loose his ox or his ass from the stall and lead him away to watering?" Luke xiii. 15. Works of mercy even to a brute are not prohibited.

So also is it in regard to works of necessity, about which infidelity has made itself merry at times. Jeremiah informs us, this is no new thing: for in Jerusalem's ancient sorrows, "the adversaries saw her, and did mock at her Sabbaths." Lam. i. 7. Scoffing is cheap at first cost, but dear in the long run. There is a day of settlement ahead.

One of the most fatal fallacies of false-hearted men in this regard, is in their creating their own necessities and then making them a plea for violating the law. A country merchant arranges his business and travel so as to be on the road himself, and start his goods homeward, so as to insure their transportation on the Sabbath: then puts in his plea of necessity and robs God of his day. A lime or brick-burner puts fire to his kiln on Friday, and then claims necessity as a justification for Sabbath profanation. A railroad company contract for the delivery of goods in ten days at a distant point, knowing that the whole ten will be necessary to meet their contract, one of which ten is the Sabbath, and then

plead the necessity of their own creation, as a justification for violation of law. That is, in all such cases, the wrong doer takes advantage of his own wrong, and that in the face of man's law and God's. Let all such villany know that it cannot succeed. "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. vi. 7. The government also feigns necessity in the matter of mails and post-offices. The people of the United States lived, and were happy and prosperous, when a letter required three days and a half to pass from New York to Washington; and yet now, when part of one day only is required, commerce cannot dispense with Sunday mails—they are a necessity, and this necessity, created by avarice, and having no foundation but lust of gain, is flung in the face of God as a reason to justify the violation of his law; and thus a Christian people "bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath." "Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed God, even this whole nation." Mal. iii. 9. How large a proportion of our recent calamities and present perils is a visitation from God for these transgressions of his law, it is not for us to say. "Shall I not visit for these things? saith the Lord: and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" They "have dealt very treacherously against me, saith the Lord. They have belied the Lord, and said, It is not he: neither shall evil come upon us; neither shall we see sword

nor famine." Jere. v. 9, 12. For none of these violations of the Divine law is there any real necessity. They all spring from lust of money, and evince a preference for the worship of Mammon over the worship of God: they exhibit a purpose, among the people and in the nation, to adore the almighty dollar and to bow down before the golden calf.

A real necessity, which has moral power to suspend the law, must be of God's creation, not man's. When the authority which established the law is put forth for its suspension in a given case, then the doing of the thing forbidden in general is now, and in this particular, permitted, and is not a sin. If a sheep or a man fall into a pit, or my house takes fire on the Sabbath, it is my duty to use every effort to prevent the destruction of life and property. But let no man purposely set his house on fire, or pitch his sheep into a pit, and then insult reason and God by justifying his own wickedness.

On this whole subject of necessities, no conscientious Christian has much difficulty. If the heart be right—if it purpose to obey God, scruples of conscience are thrown into the balances of the sanctuary, and the scale turns to a right decision. It is only where the heart is depraved and racked with unholy desires, that conscience, as a discriminating faculty, abides more than a moment in a state of equilibrium on the question of doing secular service on the Lord's day. A pure conscience

adopts the rule—"let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind:" if there is a doubt, pause—"he that doubteth is damned [condemned] if he eat; because he eateth not of faith; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

These negations are, to us practically, infinitely numerous. A few more, by way of sample, it may be well to mention. (1.) Reading newspapers or books which treat of matters of worldly concernment. (2.) Visiting for pleasure is a very common offence and often formally defended, though clearly prohibited as not being a duty to God. (3.) So Sunday dining parties are a high offence, of which no conscientious Christian is ever guilty. (4.) Barbering as a "business" is a sin on Sabbath. The poor barber has as good a right to freedom from labour on the Lord's day, as the tonsured wight who makes a slave of him. If being shaved is a necessity, it is one of his own creation and therefore his sin. Let him put it into the same class with washing and eating and do it at home and permit freedom to the poor shaver. (5.) Cooking victuals—for this infidelity has often scoffed and displayed its silliness for ridicule. Christian families everywhere, feel it their duty not to exact any extra services off the cook on Sabbath day: but on the contrary, always so arrange this necessity, as to afford the fullest practicable liberty to the cook and her aids, to attend to Sabbath privileges. And it is for this reason, such families have less trouble and better

success in procuring such service, than those who profane the Sabbath, and tyrannize over their servants. (6.) Where *baking* is a *business*, every arrangement practicable ought to be made for the freedom of the hands that do the work. The miracle of a double supply of manna on the day preceding, and none on the Sabbath, is instructive. We ought to secure the same ends, by ordinary means, as far as practicable: just as we supply an educated ministry in room of the miraculously qualified preachers on the day of Pentecost. The great majority of families and the most healthy, all over the land, bake no bread on the Lord's day. And Nehemiah "testified against them, in the day wherein they sold victuals, wine, grapes and figs." (7.) Plays, games, races and theatres, corrupting morals on week-days, are peculiarly injurious and unjust on the Sabbath. Their introduction is a great aim of the foreign combination, now organized in our country to overthrow our Sabbath, and that as a means of introducing a religion of forms, corruption and despotic power: and all this "under pretence of conscience" as William Penn foresaw in A. D. 1682.

We pass over to the POSITIVE duties. Idleness, as before remarked, is a sin; and therefore the Sabbatic law provides abundant employment and of a higher nature, for the holy day.

Here we must exercise the grace of brevity: and the more readily, because the positive duties are

openly known and read of all men. Many are indeed private; and in kind common to all days; differing on the Lord's day only in degree. Among these we follow Penn.

1. In naming, that "they may the better dispose themselves to read the Scriptures of truth, at home." Private, devotional reading, meditating on, studying the Scriptures of truth, covers secret prayer—family religion, instruction of the household—as Penn says—"Masters, parents, children, or servants:" they each are to dispose themselves to this exercise. Personal, private devotional reading and care contemplated. Family—home training, by all the now immensely extended and complicated means of instruction—family Sabbath-schools—family preaching, singing God's praises, (though Penn probably did not specially commend this) family prayer.

2. The semi-public services of the Sabbath-school are an admirable aid and auxiliary to family drilling —not a substitute for it; but an aid: and a passport to the public services. This institution may not aspire to a third estate in the church: but must be kept in its true position under the control of the spiritual government of the congregation; as a very important branch of the church's solemn charge.

3. The public worship of the sanctuary is the great instrumentality of the Sabbatic law. The observance of a Sabbath, without an holy convocation and an abrogation of all servile work, is an unheard of impossibility. The necessary conse-

quences—the bearings of it upon health, wealth, intelligence and morals is open and obvious over the whole Christian world. These topics have been up already, and need not now be expanded. Suffice it to say—the prosperity, the wealth, the intelligence, the morality and religion of every nation has each its exact measurement in the degree of its actual Sabbath observance.

The two nations, which pre-eminently regard the Lord's day—England and America, now rule the destinies of the world; and to them are committed by high heaven, the glorious commission of proclaiming the salvation of God to the ends of the earth; and of bringing all the nations under the dominion of government by moral law. But we may not farther repeat.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

DUTY OF HEADS OF FAMILIES, AND NATIONS—PLEA OF FOREIGNERS—LET US ALONE.

Relations—1. To son and daughter—2. To his man-servant and his maid-servant—3. Nor thy cattle—4. And thy stranger that is within thy gates.

We have not specially noted the relation of this organic law, to heads of families. It is addressed to the individual man—"*Thou* shalt not do any work"—follow up any business. But if the individual be the head of a house—if he stand in any responsible relation to any other persons or things, the constitutional rule views him in all these relations, and holds him to his responsibilities. For all his faculties, powers, talents, capabilities of doing good or evil, the Creator and universal proprietor holds every man to account. "Occupy till I come;" and at his coming the account must be rendered. Carrying with us the well-established rule of hermeneutics; that, where a duty is commanded, the contrary sin is forbidden; and where a sin is forbidden, the contrary duty is commanded—let us glance at the *relations* of this individual.

1. *To his son and his daughter.* These are under

his control. He has the right and power of government over them: he is bound for their maintenance and education; has, to a large degree, the formation of their characters, their physical habits, their intellectual, moral, and religious training; and, to society and to God, is accountable for their conduct. These powers and responsibilities are not, as has been supposed, consequences anticipated, by reason of his expenditure of time and labour, and money in their early support; but all flow from the divine constitution of our nature, by which the father is appointed God's agent to attend upon this very thing. If therefore the son or the daughter transgress the command, the father must give account of it. He was vested with power to restrain, and he neglected his duty—like Eli, whose "sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not." If a father from looseness of discipline, irreligion, and atheism train up such children, he may reasonably expect a Hophni and Phinehas, and to hear some day news "at which both the ears of every one that heareth shall tingle." Let parents study their relations and accountabilities. Let them see and know, that "a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame;" yea and his father too. Let your children have liberty—the freedom of the streets, the theatres, the saloons, the rum shops, and lager beer houses; then, parents! lay out your accounts for heavy tidings: drive them to work or sports on the Lord's day and they will soon work your ruin and

their own. But, per contra, train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Seize for them the promises and keep them under the restraints this law implies, and they will furnish you many a quiet and peaceful Sabbath.

2. *To his man-servant and his maid-servant.*

Slavery has never had the sanction of God, in any other sense, than as monarchical governments or wicked wars have been sanctioned of God. The Bible has always recognized its existence as an evil, and tolerated it as an evil to be remedied and brought to an end. That inequalities in human condition should exist, is a manifest provision in the arrangements of divine wisdom. Had man kept his first estate of purity and subjection to God, there would still have been a necessity for a government in human hands, by the application of divine laws in regulating the intercourses of society. Rulers of various grades must have existed. The very nature of society involves this. Adam was made the natural head and also the moral head and ruler of his race. He was appointed to keep and dress the garden; and, beyond doubt, his children, had they all remained pure and holy, would have occupied positions relatively to each other, of superiority and of inferiority.

> "Order is nature's first law; and this confest;
> Some are and must be greater than the rest."

But sin rendered these unavoidable inequalities

grievous, oppressive, and often intolerable; because sin is a tyrant and all that is burdensome and cruel in the exercises of power, growing out of these diversified relations, has its root in sin. When, and because, man became the slave of sin and Satan, he became also the slave of his fellow-man; for his fellow-man was a fellow-sinner. Therefore the divine law made provision for these inequalities; but this provision by no means contains an approval of them. God made man upright and yet his law provided for a fallen and sinful condition; yet surely, this provision gives no sanction to sins prohibited. The law assumes the relation of master and servant as a fact and legislates for its regulation; just as it recognizes blasphemy, idolatry, rebellion against parental authority, sexual pollution, false witness, &c., as facts, and prescribes rules for their restraint and punishment.

"Now I say, *That* the heir, as long as he is a child—a minor—differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all." Hence the rules and reasons above remarked on, in regard to the son and the daughter, are equally pertinent to the man-servant and the maid-servant. The master has the same authority over the servants as over the children, for government, for instruction, for restraint or coercion as to labour. Consequently he is under exactly corresponding obligations. He is responsible to the author of the law, for their labour and for their cessation from labour. Be the relation of

master and servant constituted as they may—whether by purchase with money, or by being born in his house; and whether permanent, as in slavery, or temporary, as in hirelings; whilst it lasts, the master's responsibility lasts. If his hired servants do servile work for him on the Lord's day, he must render account to God for this iniquity.

3. *Nor thy cattle.* Working animals,—beasts of burden, in whatever form their strength is exerted for the benefit of man and under his direction, come, all within the sweep of this precept. But now, a man's oxen and horses are a part of his capital; and differ from houses and lands and farming utensils, and money the representative of all, only in this; that the live stock are sentient beings, capable of suffering pains from abuse and excessive labour, which is abuse. With allowance for this merciful protection to animal life, we see no difference between this sort of capital and any other; and therefore must think, that the spirit of the law holds the owner of all capital responsible for working it himself or having others to work it on the Lord's day. It is, consequently, as much and as really a transgression of law, to work cotton or iron works, whether propelled by water or steam, as to work animals, the cruelty excepted. Nor is it in the power of logic to show, that a farmer who drives his own team, with a load of his own wheat to market on the Sabbath day, is more an offender against law,

than the capitalist who sits in church at the same time, but whose capital, equal in amount, or ten times greater, is running railroad cars or cotton machinery on the same holy day. What a man does by his agent, he does himself. He that pays wages to a thief or robber, for assisting to accomplish his evil designs, is himself a robber or thief. No moral axiom is more obvious and more generally admitted. We conclude that stockholders in Sabbath-breaking companies, whether stripped of their souls by the exorcising power of an incorporating act or not, are Sabbath breakers, and will be held accountable to the law and its Author, God. Oh! that all friends of the Sabbath, to whom God has given success in business, would see to it, that their capital employed in violating the Sabbath, may not be accusing them before the beneficent Giver; whilst themselves are testifying personally, in the sanctuary, in favour of the Sabbatic law. It is a question worth serious prosecution, how far men, who have prospered in business until their capital has outgrown their concern, so that they have a surplus to invest in some other way, have ventured it in Sabbath-breaking stocks; and have suffered loss and even ruin in consequence. And may it not be asked, whether Christian men who thus offend are not more likely to suffer for such sin, than others. Assuredly God is at least as much offended by sin in his own people; and as likely to chastise them on its account; as he is with the same sin in others who profess no regard

to him and his laws, and whom he punishes for their transgressions.

4. *And thy stranger that is within thy gates.*

Gates, in eastern cities and in ancient times, were places of public resort. In large towns they were often fortified strongly with bulwarks and towers of defence. They were, moreover, places of trade—market-houses, as you see in the reference to Nehemiah—and they were court-houses, where magistrates dispensed justice. To be *within thy gates*, then, can mean nothing less than to be under the protection of the civil and military power of the city. And as protection begets allegiance for the time being, the stranger or person born in or coming from a foreign land, voluntarily pledges obedience to the law and subjection to the government of the family and household in which he has, with its consent, located himself. And as the city, the State, the nation consists of the households included in it, the stranger owes allegiance to government in all these forms. Moreover, there is an obvious sense in which he is more rigidly bound in this allegiance than the sons and the servants born in the house, city, and nation. The home-born or the purchased slave, and the home-born son, did not come into the household, city, and State by their own *voluntary* action, as did the stranger. He came in of his own accord, and he abides of his own will. He can go away whensoever he pleases. His coming was a contract. He knew the laws when he came in: or

if not, he acted very foolishly. His coming in is a real *bona fide* promise of subjection to them whilst he sojourns in the land. In this sense he is more obviously bound than those born or brought into the household, city, or State. His is *voluntary;* theirs is not primarily so. These facts are indisputable and these obligations are insolvable but by the destruction of society and government. If strangers could come into a family without coming actually under the laws of the household, two or three such ungoverned intruders must break up and destroy the household. And so of the city, State, or nation. Thus the Gallic nations were subverted by the Romans. Thus the Roman Empire was overturned by the Huns, the Goths, the Vandals. Thus the Danes swept off the Britons; the Angles and Saxons the Danes; and the Normans the Saxons. Nations have perished chiefly by foreign interference. So passed away the aborigines of America. Hear the voice of Mount Vernon: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow-citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of Republican government." The voice from Mount Sinai is re-echoed from Mount Vernon: Keep the stranger within thy gates subject to thy laws. The head of the house, the city, the State, is responsible for the foreign inmate, and bound to restrain him from Sabbath profanation.

Yet here, in free America, a Christian nation, we have a combination of foreigners, who voluntarily emigrated from their own country, and were kindly received within our gates, arraying themselves under the leadership of Jews, and Deists, and Atheists, for the avowed purpose of subverting one of the most distinguished laws of our religion and of our government—a law that has adorned the statute book of Pennsylvania for one hundred and eighty-three years—a law that has governed man, for whom it was made, wherever a knowledge of true religion has not been wholly lost, from the beginning of the world. This conspiracy against the fourth commandment we are, by itself, commanded to resist, and to enforce its sacred observance upon all the strangers within our gates: and woe be to this city, state, nation, if we permit this renewed attack upon our organic law to triumph.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### OBJECTION—THE SUNDAY LAWS OF THE STATE—CURTAIL LIBERTY.

German combination—laws are a restraint—every precept of the ten restrains—not bondage but freedom.

I CANNOT easier and better express this objection, than by quoting a paragraph from the New York Spectator for September 13th, 1859, which is found in a very able article of the Princeton Review for October of that year. It presents it in the language of a foreigner addressing a public meeting of foreigners assembled to resist American laws, that "The free thoughts which they had brought with them from Germany should be established here." Men, born under despotic governments and held in political slavery all their lives, no sooner arrive in this free Protestant country, than they become reformers—revolutionists and aim at the overthrow of our institutions, Christianity itself included. This speaker is reported as exclaiming: "Free Germans and citizens of America, let us join hand in hand with all other free citizens around us, to oppose a law which is unjust, and an infringement on our sacred liberty. The Sunday laws are only

the tools used by cliques of politicians to further their own ambitious ends, in opposition to the interests of mankind. They are upheld in the sacred name of religion. We all have our own views about religion, and we mean to keep them without infringement, or being forced to adopt those of other men. We honour all days, and consider what is right to be done on one day is right to be done on another. Men should be left to the exercise of their own judgment in regard to the way they spend their time. If they wish pleasure, let them have it; if they wish social enjoyment and enlivening music, let them have it. This is freedom." This then is the anti-Sabbath men's notion of liberty as to the Sabbath. Their birth-right in enslaved Germany becomes freedom to set our laws at defiance and distract our cities, towns and country with fun and frolic, drinking, singing, theatres, and all their pleasures on God's holy day. *This is freedom*, and this is the claim which this chapter proposes to resist.

Now, at the very outset, we concede to our German freemen, that the Sabbath laws are a restraint upon the conduct of men and women. They are hereby restrained, forbidden, and kept back from doing their own *pleasure:* but only when their pleasure is to do wrong, in violating the laws of Christianity, and disturbing the public peace, and interfering with the rights and privileges—the religious and sacred privileges of the Christian people

around them. If mere restraint upon conduct is an infringement on your sacred liberties, we plead guilty. Very many of our laws are designed and well adapted to operate restraint, ex. gr. We have a law which restrains a magistrate from forcing, or permitting a man to swear by Almighty God, that he will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and that as he shall answer to God in the great day; who does not believe there is any Almighty God—a God of truth; and any great day of judgment; or who does not believe he himself has a rational soul, that shall survive the body and be constrained to give an account of himself to God. We have a law that restrains liberty to such an extent, that a man who swears falsely or profanely shall be fined or imprisoned: another law we have, which sends a man to the penitentiary and immures him for years, thus cutting off entirely his freedom merely because he *wished pleasure*, and sought it by writing two words on a bank check. Another law we have, that strangles a man to death with a strong rope, merely because he ministered a little dose of medicine to a patient: another law we have, which arrests a freeman, holds him in durance vile and then puts six bullets through his brain, simply because he pleased to enjoy his freedom in leaving his tent and going home to his wife and children. Oh what horrible infringements on "sacred liberty" are perpetrated in this protestant country! Why we hung

a "free German" in Washington, because he served his employers faithfully.

But now, the terrible aggravations of all these and innumerable other cases, is, that they are not done by the uneducated and lawless rabble, in their senseless clamours for freedom and lager beer; but under the direct sanction of law; and by the orders and action of the officers of justice. Are then law and justice antagonistic to liberty? or is that which "looseness, irreligion, and atheism" call liberty, nothing more or less than the harlot, which infidel France, under the schooling of Voltaire, worshipped as a goddess?

We have seen abundantly, that the Decalogue is a compend of moral law, given, by the Author of his being to man: within which are the elements of all law; and outside of which, if human legislators pass, they become tyrants, not governors. We have also noted the fact, that, except the fifth precept and half of the fourth, these organic laws of God for humanity, come to us in the form of negations: they are prohibitory: they restrain action; they curtail freedom; they infringe the "sacred liberty" of doing as we please. Can it be possible that God's law is hostile to freedom? This can be answered only after ascertaining what freedom is: and the reader already perceives, that we deny liberty or freedom to consist in doing as we please. Men often please to take their neighbour's money; is this liberty? to take his house, his fruits and grains;

is this freedom? Men please to blaspheme God and curse their brethren; is this a part of freedom? to bow down and worship an idol; to offer their sons and daughters in sacrifice to Moloch, and their widows to Vishnu; is this liberty? Did the agents of the East India Company play the part of rational liberty, in protecting, if not encouraging the Suttee? Here is a fine young man of eighteen or twenty years, capable of working his way in the world, but then the law of the land and the law of God place him in subjection to his father; is this a curtailment of "sacred liberty?" He can't do as he pleases. A German resident on Walnut Hills, Cincinnati, told me, as we rode by a field, an anecdote of a fellow-countryman of his, who went into the field, dug up and filled his basket with potatoes, but was detected; upon his arrest, he replied, in justification of himself by an expression of surprise, "Vel, I tought dis was a free country." Oh, no, restraint is not a curtailment of freedom, unless it be contrary to the Decalogue. A Jew and a Turk, whose religion permits them to have two or more wives, emigrate to the United States, each "wishing pleasure" and liberty, such as they had in Constantinople; must we concede it? If our laws forbid it, they turn upon us, with fierce vituperation; charging, that America is a tyrannical government; more hostile to liberty than the tyranny of the Sultan. Mormonism is a "free-love" advocate; must this Christian republic abolish its Christian laws, in order

that these bulls of Bashan may enter the Canaan of our holy land; and therein be free to pollute the morals of the country and ultimately to subvert the nation by their corruptions? No, my dear readers, liberty does not consist in man's doing as he pleases; but in pleasing to do and actually doing right. The perfection of freedom is obedience to God's law. The devil's maxim—"Religion has nothing to do with politics," will speedily destroy any nation that adopts it. Every precept of the Decalogue designs to restrain action; and the more perfectly a man feels and submits to this restraint, the nearer does he approximate perfect liberty. It is resistance to law that constitutes the yoke of bondage. Not one precept of the Ten ever galls the neck of the obedient disciple of Christ. But he that committeth sin is the servant of sin. The victim of lager beer and bad whisky, in the midst of his fun and frolic; his Sunday dancing and fiddling, and theatricals, is a miserable slave. "These are wells without water; clouds that are carried with a tempest; to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. For while they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness, those who were clean escaped from them who live in error. While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption, for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage."

On the contrary, instead of religion having noth-

ing to do with politics, our maxim in America is, that our whole political institutions are based and founded on the Christian religion. It is the platform of our laws, common and statute. We quote the last paragraph of the masterly article above referred to.

"The same answer the Christians of this country give all classes of men, who demand that Christianity should be divorced from our governments, municipal, state and national. This country was settled by Protestant Christians. They possessed the land. They established its institutions. They formed themselves into towns, states, and nation. From the nature of the case, regarding the Bible as the word of God binding the conscience of every man with Divine authority, they were governed by it in all their organizations, whether for business, or civil policy. Others have since come into the country by thousands; some Papists, some Jews, some infidels, some atheists. All were welcomed; all are admitted to equal rights and privileges. All are allowed to acquire property, to vote in all elections, made eligible to all offices, and invested with an equal interest in all public concerns. All are allowed to worship as they please, or not at all if they please. No man is molested for his religion or for his want of religion. No man is required to profess any particular form of faith, or to join any religious association. Is not this liberty enough? It seems not. Our 'Free Germans,' and other

anti-Sabbatarians insist upon it, that we must turn infidels, give up our God, our Saviour, and our Bibles, so far as all public or governmental action is concerned. They require that the joint stock into which they have been received as partners, and in which they constitute even numerically a very small minority, should be conducted according to their principles and not according to ours. They demand, not merely that they may be allowed to disregard the Sabbath, but that the public business must go on on that day; that all public servants must be employed; all public property, highways, and railroads, should be used. They say we must not pray in our legislative bodies, or have chaplains in our hospitals, prisons, navy, or army: that we must not introduce the Bible into our public schools, or do anything in a public capacity which implies that we are Protestant Christians. These men do not know what Protestant Christians are. It is the characteristic of Protestants, as they humbly hope and believe, to respect the rights of other men, and to stand up for their own. And, therefore, they say to all—infidels and atheists—to all who demand that the Bible shall not be the rule of action for us as individuals, and as a government, You ask what it is impossible can be granted. We must obey God. We must carry our religion into our work-shops, our banking-houses, our municipal and other governments; and if you cannot live with Christians, you must go elsewhere."

## CHAPTER XX.

### THE SABBATH—A TYPE OF HEAVEN.

All that is painful in labour is the result of sin: when, therefore, sin, as to its guilt, shall have been removed by the blood of the great Atonement; as to its pollution by the renewing of the Holy Ghost; the cause being taken away, the effects will cease. Rest follows. Cessation of painful exertion is gone for ever. When Israel escaped from the land of bondage and the turmoil and harassments of the wilderness, and crossed the Jordan, he entered into rest. But this Sabbath in Canaan, as Paul has shown, is a figure of another and a holier rest in the gospel state of the Church: and still farther, this state, with all its enlargement and all its blessed comforts, is preparatory and typical of a higher and holier Sabbath beyond the Jordan of death. There remaineth, therefore, a Sabbatismos for the people of God.

Among the deliverances of which the Sabbath here is typical, is removal beyond the reach of persecutions and tribulations: Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them

that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels. As the Christian Sabbath separates the sacred from the profane, and sets them aside for a time, to the special service of their Lord, to enjoy his presence in the sanctuary, so the type promises and portrays an everlasting separation between the righteous and the wicked; the holy and the unholy.

Deliverance is also perfected from the assaults of foul spirits and all the temptations to which we are here exposed. Far away from this happy rest are banished for ever the arch fiend and all his company, and are never more permitted to disturb the quiet of the everlasting Sabbath.

But exemptions and negations constitute a very small proportion of the blessings typified by the Christian Sabbath. Positive blessedness, inconceivably great, characterizes the happy abode on high, in those many mansions of our Father's house, which the Forerunner has gone to furnish up and prepare for us. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is."

Undoubtedly the eternal Sabbath, like its type here, will be a day of holy activities. The spirits of the redeemed, and, after the resurrection, their

entire persons, will be active in the service of God; and that increased, as the purified souls and the spiritualized bodies, have increased capacities for heavenly joys. The earthly Sabbath is to them a delight; how much more the heavenly? Here they meet and recognize each other as fellow-heirs of the grace of life; they take sweet counsel and go up to the house of God, and sound forth the praises of redeeming love; how much more when clogs of clay are all thrown off and they meet and recognize each other in the heavenly Canaan! Oh, how they will exult in the high glories of the rapturous hour when sin and flesh no more control the sacred pleasures of the soul!

Our social nature will receive a large increase to its benevolent affections. We shall recognize each other. For now we see through a glass darkly; but then, face to face. Now we know in part; but then shall we know even as also we are known. And the more we increase in the activities of heavenly love, the larger expand our powers for drinking of the rivers of pleasure which ever flow at God's right hand. The imagery used to convey a general idea of this ever active Rest, is of the boldest and strongest character. Joy resounds; golden harps are strung to sound the high praises of redeeming love. Choirs stand in bright array and rival angelic hosts in beauty and glory, and rise above them in the lofty notes of thanksgiving unto Him that loved us and redeemed us unto God by

his blood. In these holy exercises there will be an ever onward movement. It is not conceivable that such employments should not keep in perpetual action the law of progress which opens up a boundless advancement in holiness and perfection. The path of the just is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

"Mid the chorus of the skies,
Mid th' angelic lyres above,
Hark! their songs melodious rise,
Songs of praise to Jesus' love.
Happy spirits, ye are fled
Where no grief can entrance find;
Lulled to rest the aching head,
Soothed the anguish of the mind.

"All is tranquil and serene,
Calm and undisturbed repose;
There no cloud can intervene,
There no angry tempest blows.
Every tear is wiped away,
Sighs no more shall heave the breast—
Night is lost in endless day,
Sorrow, in ETERNAL REST."

# APPENDIX.

DURING the present campaign against the laws of God and of this Commonwealth, the author threw a number of brief articles before the public. From these he has selected the following for preservation, as likely to be useful, should this controversy last; or the war be renewed at any future time.

PHILADELPHIA, *March 27th, A. D.* 1866.

## A PLEA FOR OPPRESSED CARMEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING TELEGRAPH—Sir:—The laws of God and of Pennsylvania protect the working-man. Capital shall not oppress labour. Their relations I shall, God willing, endeavour to point out in a future paper; at present let us look at the cruelty exercised over conductors and drivers. Seventeen hours a day they are required to labour. Seven hours only are left for the repose and sleep, without which "tired nature" has no restorer. Car riders, and car company presidents, and car-stock owners, come up and look this question in the face. Is it right? Is it reasonable

and just to force these men under such a yoke of bondage?

In the olden time, in Jeff. Davis' own State, a slave was tasked to pick—that is, to gather off the stalks in the field, twenty-five pounds of cotton per day. Whether this rule was universal I cannot say; but "Uncle Tom's Cabin" shows the slaves were tasked by quantity. I know that in Mississippi twenty-five pounds was the rule on some plantations, and that on some exciting occasions, and when time for fun in the afternoon was desired, some would bring in their twenty-five pound basket before twelve o'clock. And we people of Philadelphia exact seventeen hours off our car-men.

In Israel of old, Isaiah (lvii. 3) reproves the people for this kind of oppression. "Behold, in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and exact all your labour." If it was a sin, deserving the prophet's reprobation and God's wrath to exact all labours off the oppressed people, can it be a duty in us? "For among my people are found *wicked* men; they lay wait as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men; are become great, and waxen rich. They are waxen fat, they shine; yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked; they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, yet they prosper; and the right of the needy do they not judge. Shall I not visit for these *things?* saith the Lord: shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?"—Jer. v.

Let us ask ourselves, are we not verily guilty concerning our brethren? Are we not setting snares? Having waxen rich, have we not thrown our surplus cash into a joint-stock concern to buy traps and catch men? Seventeen hours a day for freemen, in free Pennsylvania!! Tell it not in Gath—publish it not in the streets of Charleston, lest the daughters of the slaveholders rejoice, lest the sons of the aristocracy be glad. No, my friend, this is cruelty, this is oppression.

What time have these "poor men"—to use the *Press*' phraseology—to rest? How long can the conductor sit down by his own fireside, with a little prattler on each knee, and a lovely wife, bustling about, preparing a midnight supper for a husband worn down and exhausted by seventeen weary hours, all spent standing on his weary limbs? Ah! no; the lovely little ones have been laid up already four or five hours in the humble bed, with light covering, I ween, for men that work seventeen hours must be forced, like the poor men of the *Press*, by hard necessity. And the poor wife has been sitting or stirring about for four or five hours. "Have you no pity on these poor men," and I may add to this pathetic language of Colonel Forney—these poor women? Are not the stockholders responsible for these cruelties? But I must reserve this topic for another occasion.

Now, look at the aggravating circumstances of this oppression. At this very time a mighty effort

is being made to reduce the day's labour to *eight* hours. And yet here, in the very midst of this reform, the object of which is to give a man a little alleviation from his burden, another "great reform" is advocated by a leading public journal in free Pennsylvania, which has for its declared object the additional burden of Sunday labour upon the shoulders of these oppressed men! For why? That the poor men of the *Press* may be relieved from the fearful, and to them—exhausted as they are by Saturday night and Sunday labour — unbearable burden of "walking all the way to their work in the day-time and back at night." This is what I have called "Skinning Peter to make brogans for Paul." One party of free men are crushed down under the *Press*, and lest they should be worked to death before all the marrow is sucked out of their bones, another class of Pennsylvania freemen, who work seventeen hours per day all the week, must be forced to work on Sunday too! Where, in this sin-cursed world, can you find such oppression? But we shall be told they do it voluntarily. Do they, really? Then they should be painted black and sent to Cuba. I'll say something about this voluntary slavery at another time.

## THE FREEDOM OF CONDUCTORS AND DRIVERS VINDICATED.

To the Editor of The Evening Telegraph—Sir:—We may be told, that the seventeen-hour-a-day labourers are willing thus to work: yes, they are willing to do the same on Sunday! Now, a double meaning in words is a great occasion for deception and fallacy. There is a sense in which this is true. The proverb, "root, pig, or die," leaves grumphy a choice of evils—work or death: and his pigship chooses to root as the least of two evils—he is a voluntary rooter. Now I affirm that this is the only sense in which a free-born American is, or can be made, willing to work seventeen hours per day, for seven days in the week. No man, that has a soul in him, can bring that soul up to the humiliation of such voluntary bondage. A dire necessity must first be laid upon him. The men who have him in their trap, in great condescension and love, say to him:—"Mike, we are going to run our cars on Sunday, and our men and horses must buckle to and drive ahead. How do you like it, Mike?" "Well, sir, I think seventeen hours a day for six days of the week is about tight enough on a poor fellow. Ye see, sir, I've no time to sit and nurse Pussy on my knee and amuse myself looking at Jemmy and Sue playing with the little dog about the hearth. Sir, I think I'd like to have Sunday clear. It's the only time I enjoy the home of my wife and chil-

dren." "That's true, Mike; but we'll of course increase your wages a little." "Well, sir, the Lord knows we poor drivers and conductors have hard work to get along on our present wages; everything is so dear." "Very true, Mike, but then you know 'half a loaf is better than no bread.'" "That's true, too, Mr. Railroad President! but then, a whole loaf, and a little beef and potatoes is better still." "Well, turn in, Mike, and work seventeen hours on Sunday, and the increase of your wages will buy the potatoes, at any rate." "Ah, but Mr. President—then I'll have to leave poor little Pussy, and Jemmy, and Sue, and their dear mother all day; and I'll become a stranger in my own house; my little darlings will soon not know their daddy. Please excuse me then from the Sunday." "Well, Mike, you've been a faithful driver, and I thought I would make you a fair offer, full employment, and living wages. Now I want you fairly to understand your position. You see the cars *must* run of a Sunday, and we *must* have drivers—it's absolutely necessary; and you know necessity has no law. So, Mike, if you won't another will, and we will have to part. If you won't work for us on Sunday, you shan't work for us on week days. So good-bye, Mike." "Oh! Mr. President, stop a little. There is another difficulty in my way that maybe you will think about it. Mary and I were brought up in praying, and Sabbath-keeping, and church-going families. We both think it is wrong to work on Sunday. My

father and grandfather, as far back as I can get any knowledge of them, were Sabbath-keepers, and always held the Ten Commandments to be a summary of the moral law, and binding upon the consciences of all men. I and my dear wife may be mistaken, but so it is, we *conscientiously* believe it is wrong.

"'We must not work, we must not play,
Because it is the Sabbath day.'

This we teach our children, and we still think it is right. Now, Mr. President, must we be cut off from our employment and our bread, and turned off the cars all the week, just because we want to worship the God of our fathers according to the dictates of our own consciences, as the constitution of the state, and the laws of the land, and of God say we ought? Does it not seem hard? I am willing to drive till twelve o'clock on Saturday night, and to start at four on Monday morning; but, sir, if I must pollute my conscience by disobeying God's law, the law of my native Pennsylvania, and the law of my church; or leave your company's employment, why, then my choice is, to keep a good conscience and trust to God for bread."

"Well, Mike, it is hard. I do pity you. But, you know, corporations have no souls, and I can't help it. I am but an agent for others, and must submit to my masters. So, good-bye, poor Mike."

"Just a minute more, Mr. Railroad President, if you please. If corporations have no souls, can they go to heaven, or to the other place? And if a just

God seizes upon the corporation, and administers justice according to truth for this grievous sin of persecuting all conscientious Sabbath-keepers out from their employment, how will the individuals who compose the corporation fare at the same righteous bar? Can the whole be put under arrest, and yet all the parts of that whole escape? Oh! sir, bear in mind that individual responsibility can never be merged in social responsibility. If your corporation pushes off all men who love God and his holy day, and thus persecute us in violation of law, can the individuals who compose it wash their hands of it, and say, I am clean—this sin is none of mine? Why sir, God's law protects your horses, and if you run them seven days in the week, you will kill them as you are killing us. Farewell. God bless the Sabbath-breakers with a better mind."

---

## CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

These are man and wife: their combination is necessary to production. Capital is all the production of labour. All values result from labour—of the hand and the head. Even land has no value but as it results from labour. Muscle, bone, and brain are the trinity which created, and continue to create, the world of capital, over which Plutus reigns. The adjustment of a dispute between man and wife

is one of the most difficult questions in practical morals. Milton, one of *The Press*' witnesses for Sunday labour, advocates separation of married persons, because of unhappy diversities of temper and consequent quarrels. He gives twelve reasons, or arguments for his opinion. "No ordinance, human or from Heaven, can bind against the good of man." This is the same man who wrote "Paradise lost!" Alas, how fallen! But to our topic. Quarrels between capital and labour are, like all wars, unprofitable to mankind: they stop production and tend towards poverty. And yet, as in family disputes, such quarrels often occur. Strikes for higher wages is a European fashion, which reformers are striving to make fashionable in America. This middle ground, between morals and political economy, is beset with thorns and briers; rocks, hills, and plains; peat-mosses, moors, and serbonian bogs. And yet it must be traversed. The question about an equitable division of *products*, between *capital* and *labour*, is one which ever and anon must come up, and cannot possibly be ignored. The world's history shows that, in this everlasting controversy, intellect comes out victor. The shrewd and cunning, the long heads, are too much for the round-heads—mind predominates over matter, head-work over hand-work. The lion's share accumulates, and his roar terrifies into submission; labour trembles and crouches before capital; the fecund wife cowers in the presence of the strong-armed

and clearer-headed husband. These things meet our eye everywhere.

Sunday printing and Sunday cars are merely examples of the triumph of capital over labour. Such triumphs cover the land and the world, and all ages. "The poor ye have always with you." They are results of sin, in the curse it brought with it: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground." This is man's doom as a sinner; and happy will it be for him if the labouring man, as he feels the sweat trickling down his face, can say to himself, "These briny drops are God's allotment for my sin, and there is no sovereign remedy for them but in the crimson drops which oozed out in Gethsemane and trickled down from Calvary's cross." These take away the curse out of labour, and convert even weary poverty into joy and peace. To these we commend the oppressed labourer. But whilst he ought to submit peacefully even to seventeen hours per day—but never on Sunday—he may and he ought to use all lawful means to procure a more equitable division of products. Among these lawful means are not strikes and violence. This is European; it implies despotic government; it presupposes the absence of civil rights and the ballot-box. God has provided a rational remedy. He has thrown the protection of law over labour. He furnished a prophylactic remedy in the Sabbatic law, and this even before labour was made a curse. Under this labour has its protection.

Under this John Quincy Adams threw himself for protection. When the House of Representatives were about to hold a Sunday session, rising in the sublime dignity of a man conscious of freedom and of freemen's rights, he exclaimed, "THIS HOUSE HAS NO POWER TO COMPEL ME TO STAY HERE ON THE SABBATH DAY." Let the down-trodden carmen and printers and all other oppressed workers arise to this heroic sentiment. Let them assert it everywhere. Let them carry it to the ballot-box, and all the world shall know that American freemen cannot be reduced to the condition of French or Italian or Russian serfs.

---

[From the *Presbyterian*, Jan. 13, 1866.]

## DE MORTUIS, NIL NISI VERITAS.

### VINDICATION OF LUTHER.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Living very much retired, I do not know how the question of the violation of the law of God—the Sabbath law, which is the first he ever enacted for man—has been of late brought before the public. I have not seen the Philadelphia press to any extent, but have been told that *The Press* is the leading, if not the only one in this assault on the laws of this Commonwealth, which have stood, some of them, one hundred and sixty years.

And yet the proprietor has the *courage* (shall I call it?) to affirm, in his letter to a committee of Methodist brethren, in his issue of 25th December, thus: "This controversy is of your own seeking"—and "I will show to the community before which you have so rudely dragged me," etc. How far the editor had carried his war upon the laws of God and the Commonwealth before these brethren called upon him in private, I am not aware; and what they have said or written in reply to his three long columns as above, I am also ignorant. But I suppose it was their duty, and one easily accomplished, to expose his plausible, yet flimsy arguments. This, Messrs. Editors, is not what is proposed in this paper. I leave that work in the able hands of the committee, and simply proceed to expose the unfairness of the editor's assault upon the venerable Reformers, whom he conscripts into the army he is levying against the Sabbath and the clergy of Philadelphia. To vindicate the dead, and the truth they taught, is my single object. The editor quotes Martin Luther, saying: "As for the Sabbath, or Sunday, there is no necessity for its observance, and if we do so, the reason ought to be, not because Moses commanded it, but because nature likewise teaches us to give ourselves, from time to time, a day of rest, in order that man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the word of God preached. Keep the Sabbath holy for its use both to body and mind; but if anywhere

the day is made holy for the mere day's sake; if anywhere any one sets up its observance on the Jewish foundation—then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on Christian spirit and liberty."

And this is quoted in the nineteenth century to sustain a breach of the laws of Pennsylvania and of God, by his agents in his office and on the streets! Now, it would induce to confidence if he had given reference to chapter and verse in Luther's works. How can I find this paragraph in the fifteen or twenty volumes of Luther's works, in order to scrutinize the correctness of the translation, and examine the passage in its connection? But as he states it, how does it make in favour of his Sunday work or Sunday cars?

1. Do the committee against whom he pours out his wrath—does any one of the one hundred and forty-three clergymen who signed the letter to the Mayor against Sabbath-breaking, advocate "the ascetic and gloomy observance of the first day of the week," as the editor of *The Press* asserts?

2. Does any one of them advocate the sacred observance of the day "because Moses commanded it?" Surely the editor knows better. Surely he knows we observe the sacred rest day because God commanded it in the voice of thunder from Sinai, and wrote it with his own finger on the table of stone. Is it possible this intelligent gentleman does

not know that this fourth precept of the moral law does not bless the seventh day and hallow it, but *the Sabbath day*. Now Sabbath means simply rest; and the word is never applied in the Bible but to a sacred, religious rest, and the phrase *seventh day* is never, in the book of God, applied and used as the name of the holy rest commanded from Sinai.

3. Does the editor mean to assert—he manifestly does by implication assert—but does he *mean* to assert that the clergy and Christian people of Pennsylvania "set up its observance on the Jewish foundation?" Most assuredly, no man can have become a man in this State, and not know that it is a Christian commonwealth, and never professed to build "on the Jewish foundation;" and yet it affords to its Jewish citizens all civil and religious rights, as Justice Bell, in Specht *versus* Commonwealth, has most conclusively shown.

4. What, then, does Luther mean? Exactly what all evangelical men, clergy, and laity mean, that the Sabbaths of the Jews, (of which five are mentioned in Leviticus xxiii., which are called Sabbaths, and yet distinct from the regular hebdomadal rest,) and even the Jewish appendages to this original Sabbatism are not binding on us now, but this first law of creation stands clear of all these Levitical suffixes; just as the law of marriage and the law of superiors and inferiors—the Seventh and the Fifth Commandments had appended to them the penalty of death for their violation. Luther

would say the same of both these commands if you attempt to enforce them "on the Jewish foundation." So on the first table beside the Sabbath law is the Third Commandment, which has appended to it in Leviticus xxiv. 16, the death penalty. In abandoning "this Jewish foundation," do we abandon the moral law of the Third Commandment? When the clergy of Pennsylvania take this ground, it will be time enough for the editor of the *Press* to work and to ride, to dance and feast on this holy day, the very end to which his doctrine inevitably leads. He has been entangled by the logical trap of a conditional proposition. Luther says, "If we do so"—"if any where." And it is convenient for my anti-Sabbath friend to drop the if. But now, you may get an absolute proposition out of a conditional one, but only if you remove the *if*. If the editor of the *Press* succeeds—if Sunday secular papers are cried through our streets by ragged runners and on Sunday cars, Christianity will be doomed to a terrible check. Now, if the editor drops the *if* out of this proposition, then he may assert that Theophilus means that Christianity will shortly be doomed to a terrible check. Would this be true? No more true than that Luther opposed the Sabbath.

5. But the contrary is his doctrine in this very passage, "Keep the Sabbath holy, for its use both to body and mind"—the things which he says there is no necessity for its observance are these very

Jewish appendages; and he goes on to prove the necessity for its Christian observance, because the laws of nature—the laws which God has given to our physical nature require cessation from labour, require just such a moral law as he wrote on the table of stone.

6. But how does Luther say the Sabbath is to be spent? In printing political, secular, advertising matter, and hawking the sheets through the streets, and forcing conductors and car-drivers, who labour *seventeen hours* per day for six days of the seven, to work also on the day God has commanded to be observed as a day of sacred rest? "Have you no pity, no charity for these poor men thus forced"—as you say your men are forced, but by yourself, sir? Does Luther say the Sabbath is for cars to run, that men may go away from God's sanctuary, and hold "intercourse with nature and her ten thousand blessings," as you say? Oh, no. Luther speaks not in the language of infidelity. He says —"That man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the word of God preached." Not rush out to the country, and worship nature in the grog-shops at the shanties by the way, and furnish employment for the policemen and magistrates.

7. Luther (quoted in Fairbairn, vol. ii., p. 467,) says:—"It is good, and even necessary, that men should keep a particular day in the week, on which they are to meditate, hear, and learn—for all can-

not command every day; and nature also requires that one day in the week should be kept quiet, without labour for either man or beast." And as quoted in Gilfillan, Luther (vol. v., p. 23,) says:—"Nay, after the fall, God sanctified that seventh day; in other words, he instructed his family on that day, as is testified by the offerings of his sons, Cain and Abel." "Wherefore the Sabbath was, from the beginning of the world, set apart to divine worship."

---

## VINDICATION OF CALVIN.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—The *Press* calls upon the great Swiss reformer to aid it in its assaults upon the laws of the state, the law of God, and the clergy. Let us see what Calvin teaches in his exposition of the Fourth Commandment. Insti. B. II., chap. viii. sec. xxix. "When the Lord means to intimate, in the prophets, that religion is totally subverted, he complains that his Sabbaths are polluted, violated, neglected, and profaned; as though, in case of that duty being neglected, there remained no other way in which he could be honoured.* On the other hand, he notices the observance of it with singular encomiums." Then after citing Jer. xvii. 21, 22, 27; Isaiah lvi. 2; Neh. ix. 14, he remarks,

* Here he refers to Num. xiii. 22; Ezek. xxii. 12, and xxii. 8, xxiii. 38.

"We see the singular estimation in which it is held above all the commandments of the law."

After striking at the superstitious observances of the Jews on the seventh day, he says, "Christians, therefore, ought to depart from all superstitious observance of days." This is the sense in which he understands the abrogation; it is the seventh, as slavishly and superstitiously kept by Jews; this he condemns, and proceeds in sec. xxxii. "Though the Sabbath is abrogated, yet it is still customary among us to assemble on stated days for hearing the word, for breaking the mystic bread, and for public prayers; and also to allow servants and labourers a remission from their labour." Sec. xxxiii. "I am obliged to be rather more diffuse on this point, because, in the present age, some unquiet spirits (and they are not all dead) have been raising noisy contentions respecting the Lord's day. They complain that Christians are tinctured with Judaism, because they retain any observance of days. But I reply, that the Lord's day is not observed by us upon the principles of Judaism." He defends and explains the change of day: "Now, whereas, it was expedient, for the destruction of superstition, that the day which the Jews kept holy was abolished; and, it being necessary for the preservation of decorum, order, and peace in the Christian church, another day was appointed for the same use." In sec. xxxiv. he refutes this figment, and points again to the true Sabbath of the Lord, on which a Christian man

should "observe the legitimate order of the church, appointed for the hearing of the word, for the administration of the sacraments, and for public prayer; and we should not unkindly oppress those who are subject to us. Thus vanish all the dreams of false prophets, who, in past ages, have infected the people with a Jewish notion, affirming but the ceremonial part of this commandment, which, according to them, is the appointment of the seventh day, has been abrogated, but that the moral part of it, that is the observance of one day in seven, still remains. But this is only changing the day in contempt of the Jews, while they retain the same opinion of the holiness of the day; for on this principle the same mysterious signification would still be attributed to particular days, which they formerly retained among the Jews. And, indeed, we see what advantages have arisen from such a sentiment. For those who adhere to it, far exceed the Jews, in a gross, carnal, and superstitious observance of the Sabbath."

This is the passage which the *Press* quotes, thus: "The false prophets have said that nothing was abrogated, but what was ceremonial in the commandment; but the moral part remains, to wit: the observance of one day in seven. This is nothing else than to insult the Jews, by changing the day, and yet mentally attributing to it the same sanctity, thus retaining the same typical distinction of days as had place among the Jews."

The reader will see how garbled and unfair is the *Press* quotation, forcing a meaning upon Calvin's language, the contrary of what he does in reality mean. In this xxxivth section Calvin reprobates and repudiates the superstitious observance of the Jews, in regard to the seventh day, and rebukes those who, *in past ages*, changed the day, but retained the superstitions. This utter perversion will further appear from the following testimony of Calvin from other parts of his writings.

From his comment on Exod. xx. 8–11: "While the day has ceased as the figure of a spiritual and important mystery, there are other and different ends for which it is set apart; and in respect of the duty of resting from all earthly cares and employments" [is this wide enough to take in *The Press*, its ragged hawkers, and its street Sunday cars?] "and applying to spiritual exercises in public and private, the necessity of a Sabbath is common to us with the people of old." And on Exod. xvi. 28, he says: "Under the observance of the Sabbath is comprehended the sum of all piety." Would this cover *The Press*' work, street hawking and Sunday cars? "And hereby," says Calvin, in Sec. 34, on Deut. v., "it appears what affection towards all Christianity, and toward the serving of God, seeing we make that thing" [the Sabbath] "an occasion of drawing off ourselves from God, which is given us as an help to bring us nearer unto him; and be we once gone astray, it serveth to pull us

quite and clean away—and is not that a devilish spite of men?" Will *The Press* answer this question of Calvin, and explain how this "devilish spite of men," against God's holy law of the Sabbath, promotes piety and good morals? But again, in the same sermon, Calvin says, "He who setteth at naught the Sabbath day, has cast under foot all God's service, as much as is in him; and if the Sabbath day be not observed, all the rest shall be worth nothing." Again, in his exposition of John v. 17: "The Sabbath, or rest of God—*le repos de Dieu*—is not idleness, but true perfection, which brings along with it a calm state of peace." And on Jer. xvii.: "The city will be safe, if God be truly and devoutly worshipped, and this is attested by the sanctification of the Sabbath." "Worshipped" how, Mr. Calvin, thou aid-de-camp of *The Press!*—in the printing-office? in the hawker's bundle? in the street cars carrying out their thousands of worshippers to the country to keep the peace of the city? Is this what you mean? And if not, why were you summoned up as a witness in favour of these forms of worship? But where, then, in Calvin's view, is the safety of the city, when *The Press'* reformation shall have been perfected? Again, in Henry's Life and Times of John Calvin, Vol. I., p. 112, Calvin says: "The Sabbath is the back of a spiritual substance, the use of which is still in force, of denying ourselves, of renouncing all our own thoughts and affections, and of *bidding*

*farewell to one and all of our own employments*, so that God may reign in us, then of employing ourselves in the worship of God." O, John Calvin! how could you say this, "bid farewell to one and all of our own employments?" Why, sir, you were called into court by your friend to support, by your testimony, his right duly to testify and act against the law of God's Sabbath and the laws of Pennsylvania, so that your summoner might put down both, and be free to worship God unmolested in his printing-office, where he works hard at his "enterprise, commenced in the best spirit, and conducted for no other purpose but the public good;" no profits from his labour—all for the public good! Thus, Mr. Calvin, you have played Balaam to the King of Moab; he brought you from the east, saying, Come, curse me, Israel, his law and his Sabbath, and lo! thou hast blessed them altogether.

But let the truth come on; Calvin is not through yet: in Ser. 93, on Deut. v., he says, "If we employ the Lord's day to make good cheer, to sport ourselves, to go to games and pastimes, shall God in this be honoured? Is it not mockery? Is not this an unhallowing of his name?" O, John Calvin! You have ruined the cause you were brought in to support. Why, sir, this which you call *unhallowing*, *mocking*, is the very thing advocated and demanded as a right by the anti-Sabbath men of this city. Read Isaiah lviii. 13, 14, and Gilfillan.

## VINDICATION OF MELANCTHON AND CRANMER.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—*The Press* arrays Melancthon against the Sabbath and its friends, thus—"Melancthon says, 'They who think the observance of the Lord's day has been appointed by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath, as a thing necessary, greatly err.'" Here is unfairness again. Why are we not referred to that portion of his writings whence the quotation is made? Was the editor afraid its accuracy, or the drift of its connection might show a different meaning? But history shows Melancthon's views were coincident with Luther's and Calvin's. Melancthon, in the Confession of Saxony, which he wrote, says:—"There hath been at all times, even from the beginning of mankind, a certain order of public meetings. There hath been also a certain distinction of times, and of some other ceremonies." Thus, with Luther and Calvin, Melancthon held the Sabbath, or day of sacred rest, to have been ordained from the beginning of mankind. See *Hall's Harmony*, p. 402; and on pages 435 and 436 he cites from the same Confession words written by Melancthon, thus:—"We thank God * * * for that even from the first beginning of mankind he hath preserved the public ministry of the gospel, and honest assemblies, who himself *hath also set apart certain times for the same.*" And the Augsburg

Confession says:—"Whereupon *the apostles* retained not the seventh day, but did rather *take the first day of the week for that use*, that by it they might admonish the godly, both of their liberty and of Christ's resurrection." "It was meet," says Melancthon, "that the apostle should on this account—the resurrection of Christ—have changed the day." *Wills' Practical Sabbatarian*, p. 512. And this is the man whom the *Press* presses into its unhallowed work of profaning the Christian Sabbath by press-work, street-hawking, and Sunday cars! But this ungracious struggle to make the Reformer speak a language the contradictory of what he does speak, cannot succeed among a Sabbath-keeping people. They will go behind garbled quotations without reference, and they will unveil the fraud. Philip agrees with Martin, saying, "Wherefore the Sabbath was, from the beginning of the world, set apart to divine worship." And Martin agrees with Philip, "That the apostles should, on account of Christ's resurrection, have changed the day."

Cranmer is the next witness called to the stand to testify in favour of Sunday cars, and Sunday printing, in violation of God's law enacted for man at his creation, and of Pennsylvania's law enacted in 1705. There is effrontery in this attempt at deception which merits some sharpness of rebuke. Cranmer lived in the midst of the terrible conflict between Popery and Christianity—in the reign of

Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and sealed his testimony to the truth under bloody Mary's persecuting reign, A. D. 1556. Among many points of disputation between Papists and Protestants was the question of holy days; the former contending to blood and fire for the observance of many days as sacred and obligatory, simply and wholly on the ground of church authority; the latter almost universally repudiating all but the Sabbath, and that solely on God's authority, and involving the change to the first day of the week. Now, in this transition state—this state of disputation and bloody strife—it were most unreasonable to look for those clear and definite views which characterized later days. The Archbishop, however, has recorded his testimony. In a tract published in 1540 and 1543, and designed as a union measure, for it was signed by five Papal bishops, as well as by Cranmer and Latimer, entitled, "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," our doctrine is distinctly stated, along with some points which are not correct—"The Fourth Commandment is distinguished from the other nine, the latter being merely moral, the former ceremonial, as regards 'rest from bodily labour on the seventh day,' which belonged only to the Jews; but moral as regards the spiritual rest from sin, which binds Christians at all times—the command, however, binding also to rest from all bodily labour, and to the exclusive service of God at certain times." This testimony is pretty strong,

being published at a time when the church authorities and the king were not able to prevent all kinds of open profanity, even during the hours of communion and mass.

Cranmer's Catechism (1548) states, "That they must employ and bestow the Sabbath day upon godly works and business—and that to spend the holy days in the neglect of such works, or 'in idleness, banqueting, dancing,' etc., is 'a great sin,' for which God punishes us with diverse kinds of plagues, but especially with need and poverty."—*Gilfillan*, pp. 37, 38.

A little later, "Elizabeth first allowed a public company of players to act under her name and authority. When a regular theatre was at length established, plays were acted at first *only on Sundays*, but the actors soon contrived to make four or five Sundays a week."—*Gilfillan*, p. 51. On page 48 he quotes from Miss Strickland's "Lives of the British Queens," Vol. V., 422: "Unfortunately Elizabeth's respect for the Sabbath was confined to the act of joining in public worship, for the rest of the day was devoted to sports not meet for any Christian lady to witness, much less to provide for the amusement of herself and court; but Elizabeth shared in the boisterous glee with which they were greeted by the ruder portion of the spectators. Bear and bull baiting, tilts, tourneys, and wrestling were among the noon-day divertissements of the maiden Majesty of England; dancing, music, cards,

and pageants brought up the rear of her Sabbath amusements." Such were the morals of England, necessarily following from the horrible corruptions, with which Cranmer had to contend in the preceding reigns, and especially from the utter prostration of the Sabbath. But we defy the *Press* to show that Cranmer, though hardly free from Popish trammels, ever sanctioned Sabbath profanation. And now, reader, do you wish to bring about such a state of things in this Christian nation? If you do, why then patronize the *Press* in his war upon the laws of God and your country, and advocate the running of street-cars on the Lord's holy day.

---

## VINDICATION OF BAXTER.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Among the witnesses adduced by the *Press* is Baxter. Let us keep in mind the purpose for which he has been brought into court—"All of whom," says the *Press*, "with others equally orthodox, take distinct issue with your assumptions in regard to the ascetic and gloomy observance of the first day of the week." I have shown that the insinuation, that the Christians of Philadelphia maintain and practise the ascetic and gloomy observance of the Sabbath, is wholly unfounded in truth—that it is precisely the contradictory of truth. The *Press* assuredly knows that the Protestant clergy of Philadelphia never advocated gloomy and

superstitious melancholy in sacred things. It knows that cheerfulness in the discharge of their religious duties is universal in all Protestant churches here. Why, then, this reckless innuendo? Why? Manifestly it is the play of the sophist—it is a loop-hole through which to back out of a difficulty. But it shall not avail. No one can read his words without seeing that he meant to induce his readers, unacquainted with church history, to believe these reformers were on his side of the question. This was his design, meaning and intent; but so worded as to leave a door of retreat, should any one correct his groundless insinuations. We have seen that thus he falsifies Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, and Cranmer. Let us now cross-examine Baxter, and see how far he supports the *Press'* violation of God's and man's laws about the day of sacred rest. I quote from the folio edition of his works, vol. iii.—that is, from his treatise on the Sabbath—one of the best defences of the Christian rest-day ever published.

On p. 765 Mr. Baxter throws his general argument into syllogistic form; his conclusion is in these words:—"Therefore the first day of the week is separated to holy worship by the Apostles, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." In support of this he lays down five distinct propositions; I quote the fourth and the fifth:—"4. That the Apostles did actually separate or appoint the first day of the week for holy worship, especially in church assem-

blies." He then quotes his proofs. "5. That this act of theirs was done by the guidance or inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Having demonstrated this, he raises the question, p. 782—"How should the Lord's day be kept or used?" To this he responds thus—"*Answer.* I. The day being set apart to holy worship, must accordingly be spent therein. To sanctify it, is to spend it in holy exercises."

"II. The principal work of the day is the *communion of Christians in the public exercises* of God's worship. They—the Christians—spent almost all the day together."

"III. . . Therefore it is a day of *thanksgiving* and prayer; and the special services of it must be *laudatory* and *joyful exercises.*"

Baxter finds no time for secular employments, no room for type-setting and press-work, and hawking Sunday papers through the streets in violation of law; no time for Sunday plays and sports, for bull and bear-baits, and all kinds of plays. He had had a surfeit of this during the time he spent at court, where, when a youth, he had been introduced by Sir Henry Newport, Master of the Revels; "But being entertained there with a play instead of a sermon, on the Lord's day afternoon, and hearing little preaching except what was against the Puritans, he found a month's experience of court-life sufficient, and retired with disgust."—(*Gilfillan*, p. 130.) He could not, even when a boy, endure "the King's Declaration for Sports on Sundays." O the *Press*,

how its chosen witnesses turn traitors to its cause! Baxter is nearly as bad as Luther and Calvin. But let us hear him again:

In chap. x., p. 784, he raises the question, "How the Lord's day should be spent; or what is unlawful on it?" This he answers in distinct propositions. "I. Undoubtedly it must not be spent in wickedness —in gluttony, or drunkenness, chambering, or wantonness, strife, or envying; or any of those works of the flesh which are at all times sinful. An evil work is most unsuitable to a holy day."

And yet, alas! what day hath more rioting, and excess of meat and drink, and wantonness, and sloth, and lust, than it? How very unfortunate is *The Press* in its witnesses! At every point they fail him, and Baxter sweeps the feet from him entirely. But worse, and more of it. "II. It ought not to be spent in our own worldly business." No provision, Mr. *Press*, for your "poor men" to earn a pittance on the Sabbath, to eke out the scant wages of your "subs" on the week days. Alas, no! Baxter has "no pity on these poor men," as *The Press* counts pity. They must not "walk all the way in day time to Seventh and Chestnut and back, at or in the night." No wages earned on Sunday, in direct violation of the laws of Pennsylvania! What shall these "poor men" do for bread and sour-crout, seeing they cannot earn enough in six days to keep them from the painful necessity of selling their freedom, and becoming slaves to a hard

master. Well, let us see if there is any relief in Baxter's III. answer. "The Lord's day must not be spent in tempting, diverting, unnecessary recreations, or pleasures of the flesh"—the very things for which *The Press* advocates the running of cars on Sunday. Oh, sir, why did you not interrogate your witness a little before you summoned him up to the stand? Why, he is ruining your cause. But now that he is here by your summons, we have a legal right to cross-examine, and we are not done yet. Mr. Baxter, please tell the court what you mean by "pleasures of the flesh." *Ans.* "Bowls, hunting, cards, dice, stage plays, races, dancing, bear-baitings, cock-fights, or any such sensual sports." He details, with great severity, in five classes of these sensual delights.

Then, on p. 786, he takes up an objection. "But poor, labouring people must have some recreation, and they cannot, through their poverty, have leisure any other day." This is precisely *The Press*' objection. How does his own witness meet it? Thus: "Alas! a sad argument to be used by them who, by racking of rents, do keep them in poverty." We might, as perfectly parallel, say—By stinted wages their employers cut them off from reasonable recreations on week days. The late John McDonogh, of New Orleans, gave his slaves always Saturday afternoon to themselves; and on the basis of this, under his advice, they worked out their freedom, and he sent eighty-one of them to Liberia.

Mr. Baxter's third response is thus: "Is it their bodies, or their minds, that need recreation? When the body is tired with toilsome labour, it is ease, rather than toilsome dancings and plays, that are fit to recreate it." When the labourers on the cars, or in the printing-press, the factory, anywhere, return to their homes on Saturday night, Baxter says most truly it is *ease*—and he italicises it—it is *ease* they need, and hence God, who understands their nature probably as well as *The Press* editor does, has provided this recreating ease in the Sabbath law. But our most liberal Sabbath-keeping opponents, instead of permitting their employees to enjoy the rest day at their *ease*, *force* them into the printing-office or the cars, to conduct or drive, or to rush away from the holy sanctuaries into the haunts of dissipation; the way-side traps in the country, whence they return fatigued, wearied, and worn down with recreation, if not battered, bruised, and bloody, the most natural and not uncommon result of worshipping at the shrine of Bacchus. Thus much for Baxter's testimony in support of *The Press*.

---

## VINDICATION OF KNOX.

In his new-born zeal against the day of sacred rest, Mr. Forney has given frequent cause for a smile of pity and contempt, by referring to the re-

formers as if they were on his side of the conflict. Just think, ye Presbyterians who support the creed, think of John Knox being called in to aid in a crusade against the holy Sabbath! Only think of the indomitable and stern reprover of all iniquity, in whose presence the Queen of Scotland trembled with rage and alternately wept over her sins, while Knox reprimanded her for her errors. Yes! this same Knox, "who never feared the face of man," is summoned in by an editor of a Philadelphia newspaper, to help him to defend Sunday work in printing and distributing a newspaper and running street cars! Is not this laughable!! Surely no Presbyterian need be informed that Knox did more in calling out from Rome, and forming and moulding the Kirk of Scotland, than the extremest of the rigid disciplinarians. Bishop Burnet (cited in Gilfillan, p. 160) says, "They kept scandalous persons under a severe discipline: for breach of Sabbath, for an oath, or the least disorder in drunkenness, persons were cited before the Church-Session, and were solemnly reproved for it." "In 1754, the Sessions commenced the practice of employing individuals of their number to traverse the towns on Sabbaths and other seasons of public worship, for the purpose of causing notice to be taken of such as should be found "raging abroad upon the streets, and of having them cited before the Session." And this extreme rigidness continued for a hundred and fifty years. Suppose they had caught *The Press* col-

porteurs, how then? In 1641, Charles I. visited Scotland, and attended the High Church, Edinburgh, in the forenoon of the Sabbath, but spent the afternoon in playing at golf; Henderson, the minister, conversed with His Majesty on the enormity of his offence, and he reformed for the time. (p. 161.)

In the *First Book of Discipline* drawn up by Knox, we read: "The Sabbath must be kept strictly in all towns, both forenoon and afternoon, for hearing of the Word; at afternoon upon the Sabbath, the catechism shall be taught, the children shall be examined, and the baptism administered. Public prayers shall be used upon the Sabbath, as well afternoon as before, when sermons cannot be had." And in June, 1562, the Assembly resolved, "that supplication be made to Queen Mary for the punishing of Sabbath-breaking." And again, in 1565, she was memorialized on the "manifest breaking of the Sabbath day, as among the horrible and detestable crimes" which ought to be punished. In the Assembly of 1562 or 1665, Knox voted approval of the Helvetic Confession, in which these words occur: "We keep the Lord's day, not the Sabbath, by a voluntary observance," and "every church chooses for itself a certain time for public prayer and the preaching of the gospel;" it declares "that the Lord's day was devoted to religious meetings and sacred leisure, even as early as the times of the apostles, and that it is not left free to every one

capriciously to overturn this arrangement of the church," p. 463. Alas! how sadly Mr. Forney's witnesses forsake him!

His next is Milton. In him he is not so unfortunate. Milton, like most men of his day, and many in our day, was befogged in the Red Sea—they have not been able to see the difference between the regular seventh day rest and the extra Sabbaths of the Israelites, of which you have five in Lev. xxiii. Milton was a splendid linguist, and a great poet. He has never enjoyed the reputation of a pious, a godly man. He is claimed by them of that creed as a Unitarian, and all that sect go in for a lively, slack, sportive Sabbath. "Milton was an Arian," says Hallam. "It is said that the discovery of Milton's Arianism, in this rigid generation, has already impaired the sale of Paradise Lost." This testimony of Hallam coincides with Doctor Johnson's, who says, "Milton grew old without any visible worship. In the distribution of his time there was no hour of prayer, either solitary or with his household; omitting public prayer, he omitted all." "The neglect of prayer in his family was probably a fault for which he condemned himself." See Johnson's Lives of British Poets, I., 134. This sin of neglecting prayer altogether is very probably a characteristic of Sabbath breakers as a class. *The Press*' vapouring over Milton's argument displays his own ignorance of the subject on which he writes, as well as his sympathy with other

errors of the great poet. Milton's arguments have been all answered a hundred times, and far more. The great poet's views of Christian theology, his loose and dangerous doctrines of marriage and divorce, and low estimate of the tender sex, all combine in putting him in his right place as a foe to praying and keeping holy the Lord's day. It is fortunate for the Sabbath that Milton was not its friend. Doctor Johnson says Ellwood, a Quaker, to whom he acknowledged his indebtedness for the hint, out of which sprung the "Paradise Regained," read Latin to him every day in the week, except Sunday."

---

[From the *American Presbyterian.*]

DEISM OPPOSED TO THE DAY OF SACRED REST.

"A man is known by the (book) company he keeps."

MR. EDITOR:—Having recently read a work "On the Institution of the Sabbath Day," and marked some forty passages decidedly, and more or less, explicitly, denying the divine authority of the sacred Scriptures; I herewith send you a part of them to show how open infidelity and hostility to the Lord's day affiliate. I give them just as I marked them, in the order of the pages.

"Yet in the reformatory systems of the day common sense is laid aside for Sabbath enactments,

which it is vainly believed are sufficient to reform the world, and for theological dogmas, which above all else, have ever been the cause of crime, suffering, and degradation."—Page 7.

"And they refer to the second chapter of Genesis, wherein it is stated that the heavens and earth being finished, God rested on the seventh day from all his works, and blessed and sanctified the day.

"In this account of the creation nature speaks one language, the Bible another. Shall we put aside those unchangeable marks of a creation long anterior to that recorded, to be guided by records written when and by whom no one knows?

"The account in the book of Genesis can only be considered as an allegory calculated to please children and ignorant men. In its literal sense it is entitled to no confidence. Were it even true, it does not warrant the conclusion which has been drawn from it."—Page 18.

"No one at this remote period can decide why the Sabbath was instituted."—Page 31.

"And it seems highly probable that at this period, in the reign of Josiah, [864 years after Sinai,] the Pentateuch was promulgated for the first time."—Page 44.

"Can any intelligent mind believe that the Father of Mercies has provided a conservative power to preserve and uphold all physical things, and yet has left man a prey to chance? made him dependent for truth upon the Scriptures, which so

late as the year 1516 Tyndale was burnt at the stake for translating into the English language?"—Page 175.

"Can any one believe that this book, ambiguous in its language, uncertain in its conjectures, is designed by the Almighty to be the rule of life for man?"

"The authority of the laws of Moses, which was adhered to by the Puritans, has greatly lessened, but the authority of the Scriptures generally, among those who profess to be the teachers of men, remains in its pristine vigour; and if our reasoning is true, such a doctrine is of incalculable evil to the morals and welfare of society. From infancy, children are instructed that this book is 'the Word of God,' the 'revelation of his will, the guide of life,' and with these preconceived opinions, false in their very nature, every effort to reform society fails."—Page 194.

"I touch upon the subject of the clergy with regret, because I am liable to be misunderstood;" (not at all, sir, you are perfectly well understood, to be a malicious, bitter, slanderer of the whole evangelical clergy,) "yet there can be no doubt, that it is mainly through their influence that the Sabbath superstition is spread through the country. But the system of paying men for preaching and praying is liable to great abuse."—Page 198.

"The first day of the week is the great harvest of the clergy; hence so little reliance is to be placed

upon anything they say on the subject."——"Many of them would take either side of the Sabbath question, as their interest might dictate."—Page 199. "Whose feelings I would not willingly wound."—P. 198. How brotherly thee is, Friend! "Whether in religion or literature, the clergy have always been behind the age; from them have emanated all the persecutions which have disgraced the name of religion. Their prejudices are so deep, and their interest so immediate, that it is scarcely possible that their statements should be correct."—Page 200.

"The Esquimaux and the Hottentots are effectually saved as Christians can be. The institution of a Sabbath has never come to them; but they understand the great moral principles of right and wrong as perfectly as we do."—Page 242. (If by "we," he means the little sectarian clique to which the author belongs, it is probably true.)

"Jesus left no writing behind him as a rule for others—he directed none to do so."—Page 244.

Thus infidelity marks the book from beginning to ending. It totally repudiates the Gospel. This is the book recommended by *The Press*, and which led that paper into its false quotations. What select company Colonel Forney keeps.

# INDEX.


**A**

PAGE

Affections, religious cultivated ..... 206
Atonement-day, a Sabbath ..... 79

**B**

Baking, cooking, &c., on Sabbath ..... 148
Bayonets only can keep order, where no Sabbath ..... 135
Beasts protected by Fourth Commandment ..... 156
Bible, its opposers bad; its friends good ..... 44
Bow in the clouds, a sign ..... 96

**C**

Christmas not a Sabbath ..... 84
Commandments, Ten—no penalties in ..... 77
Commandments, Ten, their matter proves them common to man 57
Commandments, Ten, organic, constitutional law ..... 52, 55, 86
Covenant, adopting the Ten Words ..... 27, 29
Cromwell's good government, owing to Sabbatic observance ..... 134

**D**

Day for Sabbath, first or seventh? ..... 115
Decalogue, its age ..... 39
Duties, Sabbath, family, Sabbath-school, sanctuary ..... 150, 152
Duty, can't be forced ..... 75

**E**

Eagle banner, a sign or token ..... 99
Evening, not the beginning of the day ..... 110
Expenses of irreligion ..... 136

F

PAGE
Feasts of the Jews, Sabbaths, but not the Sabbath..... 79
Feasts of the Jews, trumpets, tabernacles, etc..... 81
First day rest..... 119
Fourth Commandment analyzed..... 62
French Sabbath, very costly..... 136
Freedom, not in doing as we please..... 162

G

Great Law of Penn..... 15

H

Health by Sabbath observance..... 128
Hebrew constitution..... 52
History of Sabbath.....9, 19, 20, 21, 27, 37
Holy to the Lord..... 142

I

Idleness a sin..... 149

J

Jewish peculiarities no part of the Ten Words.....57, 69

K

Knowledge promoted by the Sabbath..... 130

L

Labour, incessant impossible..... 127
Labour for six days obligatory..... 66
Law and penalty distinguished..... .....70, 75, 104
Law, given at Sinai by Christ..... 31
Law, municipal distinguished from organic..... 44
Liberty, curtailed by laws of Pennsylvania..... 161
Liberty not licentiousness..... 162
Lord's day, name of Sabbath..... 123

M

Mankind, Sabbath made for.....22, 23
Manna, occasions the restoration of the Sabbath..... 12
McLeod of Glasgow, bound for infidelity.....18, 59
Mercy, in the Sabbath..... 144
Miracles accompany the Sabbath..... .....31, 32
Moral character of Sabbath..... 9

N

PAGE
Necessity in regard to works on Sabbath..... 144
Not for man to create, but God.....144, 147
Negatively holy, not all..... 142

O

Objections, Sabbath has no history..... 16
Objections, Sabbath is a sign..... 95
Objections, you must take the penalty..... 101
Objections, you must take the seventh day..... 102
Opposers of Sabbath—their character an argument vs..... 45
Organic law purely moral..... 62

P

Passover, municipal law..... 80
Penalty, variable..... 76
Penalty, severe to all Jewish laws.....77, 101
Penn's law on Sabbath..... 125
Permanency of Sabbath..... 32
Positive duties of Sabbath..... 149
Prescription, Sabbath has a right by..... 40
Prosperity, even worldly, follows the Sabbath..... 140
Public safety in Sabbatic observance..... 134

R

Reason for the Sabbath, proof its moral nature.....67, 95
Rest necessary..... 127
Rest proved by natural religion.....34, 65
Representatives of Israel adopt the Ten Words.....55, 56
Rush, Judge, on the reason of the Sabbath..... 68

S

Sabbath, beginning of..... 111
Sabbath, benefits..... 127
Sabbath, extra Jewish—annual.....79, 80, 81, 82
Sabbath, change of day..... 118
Sabbath, an organic law, not municipal.....90, 93
Sabbath, name never applied but to holy rest..... 106
Sabbath, first or seventh?..... 133
Sunday—name..... 124
Seventh day, never the name of holy rest..... 102

PAGE
Seventh day, a mystical number of perfection..... 118
Sleep a blessing..... 127

T

Ten Words, uttered in thunder.....15, 30
Time—same absolute portion, impossible .....102, 108, 109
Time, a mere plea for evasion.....102, 108

U

Usury laws of Jews a charitable rule..... 74

V

Visiting on Sabbath..... 148
Voyage round the globe, westward converts a Jewish into a Christian Sabbath ..... 148

W

Washington on foreign influence..... 159
Will of God is law..... 137

# SUNDAY CAR QUESTION.

## DECISION OF JUDGE STRONG.

Some of the complainants in the first of these bills are members of different churches, and pewholders in church buildings, situated on the line of the defendants' passenger railway in the city of Philadelphia. Others are resident in, and owners of dwelling-houses, also situated in the line of the said railway. They complain that the defendants, a corporation chartered under the laws of this commonwealth, have engaged in the business of running cars along and over their railway, with horse-power, and carrying passengers for hire, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, in violation of the laws of the Commonwealth; and that they intend to continue the said business of running the cars on the next Sunday and every Sunday thereafter. These acts of the defendants are charged in the bill to be not only unlawful, but also prejudicial to the complainants, *because* they are thereby deprived of their right to enjoy the Sabbath as a day of rest and religious exercise, free from all disturbance by unnecessary and unauthorized worldly employment; *because* they have been, are, and will

be thereby prevented from engaging peaceably and without interruption in the worship of Almighty God, in their accustomed places of worship, or in their own residences on the Sabbath day; *because* the lawful peace and quiet of the said day is thereby disturbed and broken; *because* their rights of property in their said churches, or places of public worship, and in their private residences are, and will continue to be infringed upon, and their churches and residences deteriorated in value. They therefore pray for an injunction, to restrain the defendants from continuing to run their cars hereafter over their railway on Sundays. And they now submit affidavits and proof, and move for a special injunction to continue until final hearing.

The complainant in the other bill is a stockholder in the Union Passenger Railway Company. His bill charges a similar violation of law by the defendants, and its threatened continuance. It charges, in addition, that the defendants have contracted with the United States Government, or with some of the executive departments or officers thereof, to carry the mails for the United States in and through the city of Philadelphia, on and over the streets, or some of them, and that in pursuance of said contract they are carrying the said mails. The bill further charges that they have no lawful authority to enter into or carry out such a contract, and that by reason of such unlawful acts, the charter of the company is imperiled, and the complainant is in danger of losing the

value of his stock, and being otherwise injured. He therefore asks an injunction similar to that prayed for by the complainants in the first bill, and also an injunction against any action under any contract entered into by the defendants to carry the mail. In this case also there is a motion for a preliminary injunction.

In support of these motions a great number of affidavits have been submitted, and a very large number have likewise been presented on behalf of the defendants. Much that the affiants have sworn to has no bearing upon the real questions involved in the motions. But it is certainly established that the complainants in the first bill are pewholders and worshippers in different churches along the line of the defendants' railway, or residents and owners of dwelling-houses situated on said line, and that the defendants are engaged in running their cars over and along the said railway on the first day of the week, called Sunday, and that they propose to continue so running their cars hereafter on Sunday.— So far the facts are clear. They are not even disputed.

The facts averred in the second bill are also fully made out by the proofs, and they are not contradicted.

In considering whether injunctions ought to be granted, the first question to be met is, whether the acts of the defendants complained of and proved, are contrary to law. In regard to this I have no diffi-

culty. The act of running cars over a passenger railway on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and running them, as it was shown the de-defendants have done, and as they propose hereafter to do, is the performance on that day of what is their ordinary employment or business. It is the same business as that in which they are engaged on all other days, conducted in the same manner, namely, for hire, and for the same object, which is gain. In view of the whole course of our statutory enactments, and of the decision of this court, I do not see how it can be doubted that it is a palpable violation of the law.

CHRISTIANITY PART OF THE COMMON LAW.

Christianity is a part of the common law of this State. In saying this, I utter no new doctrine. It was part of the common law of England long before this State was settled. There is a multitude of decisions to this effect to be found in the books, and it has been decided in England that it was an indictable offence at common law to write or speak of Christianity contemptuously or maliciously. The old common law of England is a part of the common law of this State. Our fathers brought it with them when they settled in the wilderness and founded this new Commonwealth. And there is abundant evidence that the purpose of William Penn and those who came under his auspices, was to found a Christian State. While the amplest provisions were made to

secure liberty of conscience, and exemption from molestation for religious persuasion or practice in matters of faith and worship, there was the most unmistakable recognition of Christianity as a part of the law, both in "The laws agreed upon in England," on the 6th of May, 1682, declared to be forever fundamental in the government of the province, and in the "Charter of Privileges" granted by William Penn to the inhabitants of Pennsylvania, and declared to be unalterable by any law or ordinance, without the consent of the Governor and six-sevenths of the Assembly met. Equally did the "Great Law," enacted at Chester, on the 7th of December, 1682, proceed upon the basis that Christianity was a part of the fundamental law of the land. I do not propose to go over the argument. No one has ever yet been able to raise a respectable doubt that this part of the common law of England belongs inseparably to the institutions of this State. And even if there could have been doubt, the decisions of this Court have set the matter to rest. In *Updegraff* vs. *The Commonwealth*, 11 S. and R., 394, it was solemnly decided that Christianity is a part of our common law. In that decision all the Judges of this Court concurred. They were eminent Judges, Tilghman, Gibson and Duncan, men whose opinion to this day command universal respect, and they fortified their judgment by an unanswerable argument.

But if Christianity is a part of the common law, it carries with it a civil obligation to abstain on the

Lord's day from all worldly labor and business except works of necessity and mercy. Christianity without a Sabbath would be no Christianity. Hence, even in England, cessation of labor and business on Sunday, was early recognized by the common law as obligatory, to a certain extent. It is immaterial now to what extent. But William Penn and the early settlers of this Commonwealth have left us no equivocal testimony of the extent to which they regarded the observance of the Sabbath as obligatory. The laws agreed upon in England, to which I have referred, ordained that every first day of the week, called the Lord's day, people should abstain from their common daily labor. And the "Great Law" of December 7th, 1682, in its first enactment, repeated substantially the injunction.

These laws, in my opinion, were declaratory of what the common law was, as introduced into this State, and the subsequent statutes enacted in 1700, 1705, 1760, 1786, and in 1794 were all in aid of the common laws. They all enjoined cessation from worldly business on the first day of the week. Their avowed purpose was to prevent vice and immorality, and as it was sometimes asserted, to protect the inhabitants of the province and State in the undisturbed worship of God, according to the dictates of their own consciences.

The cases I have before me, however, do not demand maintenance of the position that the acts of the defendants, of which the bills complain, are in viola-

tion of the common law. The statute of 1794 is still in force. It imposes a penalty upon any person who shall do or perform any worldly employment or business whatsoever on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, works of necessity and charity only excepted. There is, however, a proviso taking out of the operation of the act certain descriptions of business, or work, no one of which is the work in which the defendants are engaged. I need not spend time to prove that when a statute imposes a penalty for doing an act, it impliedly prohibits the act, and makes it illegal. If, therefore, performing worldly business on Sunday were not against common law, this Act of Assembly makes it unlawful in all but the excepted cases. And the work in which the defendants are engaged, which they propose to continue, is not embraced in any of the exceptions.

PLEA OF NECESSITY ANSWERED.

A large part of the argument before me in opposition to those motions was directed to show, if possible, that running street cars on passenger railways in this city, on Sunday, is a work of necessity, and therefore not in violation of the common law, and not prohibited by the act of 1794. The argument was based upon numerous affidavits, affirming that in the opinion of the affiants, running cars thus is necessary to enable persons residing at a distance from churches, as also the aged and infirm, to go to and return from the places where they are accustomed to

worship; that it is necessary to accommodate physicians in making professional visits; that it is necessary to afford facilities for family and social visiting, and that it is also necessary for the health and comfort of the poor, enabling them to obtain recreation and a change of air, by cheapening the means of conveyance to the rural districts. Of all these it may be said, that at most they are conveniences for others, and not necessities of the defendants, within the meaning of the Acts of Assembly. It is not for me, called as I am to administer the law as it is, rather than as the defendants may think it ought to be, to decide that what is but affording a facility, amounts to a necessity. The Legislature has not exempted from the prohibition acts which may conduce to the convenience, or contribute to supply the necessities of individuals, or even large portions of the people. It must be presumed they considered what inconvenience would follow a prohibition of worldly labor on the Lord's Day. In view of them, as well as the evils flowing from the absence of a prohibition of such labor, they enacted the statute of 1794. Their controlling object was to protect the community against vice and immorality. This they attempted to do by declaring illegal all worldly labor and business, except works of necessity and charity, but they did not overlook public and individual convenience. In the proviso of the act, they declared how far worldly labor might be done, not necessary to the agent, but contributing to the necessities of others. The enumera-

tion in the proviso of things allowed to be done, shows what was intended by excepting works of necessity from the prohibitory clause. If it was not meant by the act to forbid work which might be a convenience or even a necessity in some sense to others than the laborer, the proviso is entirely superfluous. It is plain, however, that when they excepted works of necessity they meant works of necessity to him who does them, and not to others. If this be not so, the act is without force. There is very little, if any, worldly business that does not subserve the convenience and even the necessities of some part of the community. Food, clothes, shelter and furniture are undoubted necessities. But may the agriculturist justify his ordinary worldly business on Sunday by the plea that he is thereby furnishing food for the hungry? May the cotton mills, woollen mills and clothing establishments of the country be driven, as usual, and without cessation on the Lord's Day, because they are thus contributing to provide clothing for those who need it? Is the business of the carpenter or cabinet-maker to move on through the seven days of the week, uninterruptedly and according to law, because others may need houses or furniture? May the chemist keep his laboratory in full operation on Sunday, because medicines are necessary? All these questions, and a multitude of others of similar character, must be answered in the affirmative, if running railway cars on Sunday, on city passenger railways, be a work of necessity within the meaning of

the exception in the act of 1794. It may be doubted whether keeping theatres and places of public amusements open on Sundays might not be justified by the same line of argument. Many might be found, doubtless, who would affirm on oath, that theatrical representations are conducive to mental and bodily health, and that such recreation as they afford is a necessity. Such a construction of the statute would make it but an empty sound. It would be losing sight entirely of the objects sought to be secured, the observance of a day of rest for the community, thereby enabling every one to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, without distraction, and without disturbance, and thus giving a check to vice and immorality. A construction that leads to such an absurdity must be erroneous. There is no other possible interpretation, which gives to the act any operation, but that which holds the works of necessity spoken of to such as are necessary to the actor. When the thing to be determined is whether worldly business done by any man, and not described in the proviso, is exempt from the prohibition because a work of necessity, the question must always be—is it necessary to him who does it? The defendants do not claim that running their cars for hire on Sunday is a charity, nor even that it is necessary for them. All they assert is, that it is a convenience, or a necessity for others. I think the act does not allow them to shelter themselves under others.

Moreover, the question is not an open one. It has

been settled by the solemn decision of this court. *Johnson* vs. *The Commonwealth*, 9 Harris, 102, determined that running an omnibus in a city, daily and every day, is worldly employment, and not a work of necessity or charity, within the meaning of the Act of 1794, and therefore unlawful on Sunday. This case is directly in point, and, though decided by a divided court, it is the law of the Commonwealth, from which I am not at liberty to depart, even if I doubted the correctness of the decision, which I do not. The opinion was delivered by the present Chief Justice of this court, and in it he fully met and answered the argument, now reproduced, that running a public conveyance on Sunday is a work of necessity. Judges Lowrie and Knox concurred with him. No one of these judges has ever departed from the ground taken in that case. And in *Commonwealth* vs. *Jeandell*, 2 Grant, 506, my brother, Thompson, another judge of this court, announced, in substance, the same doctrine. He declared that driving a public conveyance for hire, is doing worldly employment within the provisions of the Act of 1794, beyond doubt. His whole opinion is an assertion that running cars on city passenger railways on Sundays is contrary to law. It is then beyond controversy, that the conduct of these defendants, which the complainants seek to restrain, is a palpable violation of the laws of the Commonwealth. And I cannot doubt that it has been so considered by the defendants themselves. Their conduct in seeking protection under a

contract to carry the mails, before they began to run cars on Sunday, shows that such was their opinion. I have then before me, a corporation, a creature of law, to which the Commonwealth has granted very large privileges, at the expense of the public, palpably and persistently defying the laws of the State which gave it being. To use the language of the Act of June 16th, 1836, its acts are contrary to law and prejudicial to the interests of the community.

HOW COURTS OF EQUITY HAVE INTERFERED.

I come next to the question whether these complainants have shown themselves entitled to ask for the intervention of this court to restrain this illegal action of the defendants. It must be admitted that it is essential to such a right, that they should show that they are sustaining a particular injury. And I think it is incumbent upon them to show that the illegal acts of the defendants interfere injuriously with the rights of property. I agree that equity will not enforce a penalty, or enjoin against the commission of a crime, when it is merely a crime, and not also an injury to private rights of property. But an act may be a public offence and also a private wrong. Of this there are many examples. A public nuisance is one. And when private individuals suffer an injury quite distinct from that of the public in general, in consequence of a public nuisance, they are entitled to an injunction and relief in equity, which may thus compel the wrong-doer to take active measures against

allowing the injury to continue; 8 Sim. 193, 9 Paige 575. I am not called upon now to define minutely every class of cases in which equity will interfere. The act of 1836 gives to this court power to "restrain the commission or continuance of acts contrary to law and prejudicial to the interests of the community, or the rights of individuals." For the present I assume that the rights of individuals spoken of are rights of property. Such, I think, is the meaning of the Act. What rights of property, then, if any, have the complainants with which the illegal conduct of the defendants interferes injuriously? They own and occupy dwelling-houses along the line of the defendants' railway. They own pews in churches situate also on the line of the railway. As owners of dwelling-houses, they have a right to protection against all unlawful noise and disturbance of domestic quiet. Noise is any annoyance which may be complained of, and of which courts will take notice. The celebrated case of an injunction against ringing bells, 2 Sim. N. R., 139, is an example. My brother Thompson granted an injunction against a tinsmith at the suit of a householder disturbed by the noise of his business. It is plain that the enjoyment of real property may be seriously damaged by noise alone. Constant firing of cannon or beating of drums before a dwelling-house would render it untenantable. Now what is the nature of the enjoyment which the law secures to every owner of a dwelling-house in the Commonwealth on Sunday? I am not inquiring whence his rights come,

whether from the common law or the Act of 1794. Their origin is immaterial. It is very plain that a man has a right to a different enjoyment of his house on Sunday from that which he can claim on any other day of the week. The very purpose of the Sabbath laws, as declared in the earlier statutes, and as shown in *Commonwealth* vs. *Johnston*, and in *Commonwealth* vs. *Nesbit*, 10 Casey, 405, was that people may devote the day to rest and to the worship of God. Every unlawful thing that is distracting, that disturbs such rest, is an interference with this purpose. A man has a right to use his house on Sunday for his own devotions, and for the religious instruction of his family, undisturbed by any thing that is illegal on that day. This is a legitimate use, a right of property belonging to him as a property owner. He can no more be deprived of it without authority of law, than he can of any other use to which he may devote his house. Nor does it matter that it is a right which others may not prize. In the estimation of many, it is an invaluable right, a deprivation of which would greatly diminish the worth of their property to them. Let those call it fanciful who will, it is still true that equity will protect a party in the enjoyment of his property in whatever manner he pleases, if he does not by such enjoyment invade the rights of others. *Bonaparte* vs. *The Camden and Amboy Railroad Company*, 1 Baldwin, 230. That case holds that even if the object of the owner be not profit, but repose, seclusion, and a resting-place for himself and

family, a court of equity will protect him in *such* enjoyment. In *Jackson* vs. *The Duke of Newcastle*, 10 Jur. N. R., 689, it was held that equity has jurisdiction to prevent an injury that renders a property unsuitable for the purpose to which it is applied, or which lessens considerably the enjoyment which the owner has of it. And in *Bostock* vs. *The North Staffordshire Railway Company*, 2 Jur. N. S., 248, an injunction was granted to prevent a regatta on a lake, whereby crowds would have been drawn to the neighborhood of the complainant's property, disturbing its privacy. The language of the Vice Chancellor is significant. Said he, if it be objectionable, if he conceive it to be injurious to him, in interfering with his comfort, or even as distasteful, he (the complainant) has a right to confine the enjoyment of the defendant's right within the essential terms of the contract by which it was obtained. I may not feel prepared to go quite this length, but these cases show that the law recognizes as a right of property a right to repose in one's dwelling, and freedom from external disturbance.

RIGHTS OF PROPERTY INVADED.

Especially are pew-holders entitled to protection in the enjoyment of their pews, as pews are designed to be enjoyed. Pews in churches are real property, recognized as such by the law. They are the subject of sale, and they often bring prices equal to the value of many small farms. An action may be maintained

for disturbance of their enjoyment. But the whole value of a pew consists in the facilities it affords for joining in public worship, and for receiving the instruction given in church. To render it unfit, in any way, for the purpose for which such property is designed or used, is its destruction; and it may amount as fully to an irreparable private wrong as in any unlawful act against which a chancellor enjoins.

Such being the rights of property of the complainants, Sparhawk and others, the next question is whether the unlawful acts of the defendants interfere with these rights. On this subject the proofs leave no doubt. One of the complainants has sworn that the running of the cars past his house on Sunday so disturbs the quiet of his house as to compel him to keep the front windows closed; and, when reading aloud to his family, to abandon the front rooms. He considers it is such an invasion of his enjoyment that it depreciates the value of his property. All the other complainants, who charge unlawful interference with the lawful enjoyment of their dwelling-houses, assert, on oath, substantially the same grievances. They are driven from the front rooms of their houses; their meditations and their Sabbath rest are broken up; and the lawful uses to which they desire to devote their property are made impossible.

Equally palpable is the invasion of the rights of the other complainants who are pew-holders in churches. The evidence shows clearly that they are

disturbed in that enjoyment of their pews to which they are entitled, and without which the pews are valueless. Their attention is distracted; they can hardly hear the preacher. They lose some of his words. In one instance a whole prayer was lost. The solemnities of a communion service are interrupted; and worship generally is very seriously hindered. The noise of running the cars, the grating of wheels on curves, the clatter of horses' hoofs in starting, the sound of the signal bell, and the hallooing of those who wish to stop the cars for passage, seriously annoy the occupants of the pews; and lessen, if they do not destroy, that enjoyment of their property which the law accords to them. And the wrong of which they complain is a continuing one. The cars have run for weeks on Sundays, and it is proposed to continue such running hereafter. To decide that this is not a case where the defendants are acting contrary to law, and prejudicially to the rights of individuals, is more than I am able to do. Nor is this invasion of the complainants' rights in any manner contradicted. It is no traverse of the averment of a pew-owner that he is disturbed in the lawful enjoyment of his pew, to assert, and to prove that others are not disturbed in the enjoyment of theirs. Their pews may not be similarly situated. They themselves may not wish to pay as close attention to the church services as the complainants do. Their attention is no measure of the attention which the complainants have a right undisturbedly to give.

The question before me is whether the *complainants* are disturbed. While it is true that no man can be compelled to any form or degree of worship, it is equally true that no man can be disturbed in that worship which he may desire to render to his Sovereign God.

OTHERS NOT DISTURBED.

Nor are any of the numerous affidavits submitted by the defendants in conflict with the proofs that those of the complainants who are owners of houses along the line of the defendants' railway are disturbed in the lawful enjoyment of their property. The affiants are not disturbed in *their* dwelling-houses. The uses to which they may wish to devote their property may not be the same. They may not wish to devote the Sabbath to meditation, and to the religious instruction of their families. But the complainants do, and therefore they are disturbed. I need not say that what may be no annoyance to one man may be an unlawful disturbance to another. In this land of religious freedom, a man may, if he pleases, regard the Sabbath as sacred, the Lord's day, as it is called in the Act of Assembly. Another may not. One may use his house as a place for meditation, quiet and repose, a place for family instruction and devotion. Another may devote his property to no such uses. They are, however, lawful uses. The first may not interfere with any lawful use to which the other may apply his property.

They may not interrupt his lawful use of his own. It is very obvious that to one desirous of devoting his house to religious uses on the Sabbath, what would be no annoyance on a week day would be a very serious one on Sunday. An outcry at the dead hour of night, or near a sick chamber, is a very different thing from a similar noise at any other time or place. So a business or a noise which would be unnoticed on a week day, compels attention, and positively disturbs on Sunday. It was to this that my brother Thompson alluded when he spoke of the "peace of the Sabbath" in Jeandell's case, a right of the public involving a corresponding duty of individuals, larger on Sunday than on any other day. The public right has a corresponding private right in the citizen.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST AN INJUNCTION.

Without then referring in detail to all the affidavits submitted, though I have read and considered them all, I entertain no doubt that the action of the defendants is not only contrary to law, but that it is a substantial and continuing invasion of the rights of property belonging to the complainants, which, unless arrested, must render such rights comparatively valueless. Why, then, should I not interpose an injunction? Because, first, say the defendants, their act is a crime, and equity never enjoins against the commission of a crime. The objection is plausible rather than substantial. It is true that equity does not generally enjoin against a crime as a crime, but

the books are full of cases in which an injunction has been decreed against acts injurious to individuals, though they may have also amounted to a crime against the public. I have referred to some of these cases. Others are so numerous that it would be an affectation of learning to cite them.

Again, it is objected that the act of 1794 prescribes the penalty to which the defendants are subject, and that under the act of 1806 the complainants can resort to no other remedy. The objection makes the act of 1794 substantially a license law. It was repudiated by Judge Thompson in Jeandell's case, and it is a perversion of the act of 1806. It confounds the public offence with the private injury. The act of 1794 provides no remedy for the private wrongs, and the bills do not seek to punish the public offences. Even if the running of cars on Sunday, in the prosecution of ordinary worldly business, be not illegal at common law, which I am unwilling to admit, the act of 1794 undertakes no more than to provide a penalty for the public offence. It leaves private sufferers to seek redress in the ordinary modes accorded by judicial tribunals. It would, I think, startle the community, to be told that when an act of Assembly prohibits storing powder in quantities, under a penalty recoverable only by the Commonwealth, a man whose property has been blown up by powder illegally stored, has no redress against the wrong-doer. Such is not the law.

It is further objected that an injunction ought not

to issue until there has been a trial at law. I know that, in applications to a court of equity to restrain a nuisance, if there be serious doubt in regard to the title of the complainant to the property injured, or doubt whether any nuisance exists, or whether the complainant is specially injured by it, a chancellor will refuse to act until the doubts have been settled by a trial at law. Such a trial is for his information. But what doubt is there in this case? None in regard to the facts. The title of the complainants to their pews and dwelling-houses is not denied. The extent of their rights as property owners is a matter of law. It cannot be submitted to a jury. The running of cars on Sunday by defendants is admitted. That this is illegal is a determination of law, and that there is a special injury to the complainants, consequent upon this breach of law, is proved, and not contradicted. What, then, is left to be submitted to a jury? What their finding must be is a foregone conclusion. How, then, could my conscience be informed or guided by any trial at law? The objection is therefore inapplicable to any such cases as these now before me.

THE INJUNCTION GRANTED ON BOTH BILLS.

The result of all this is, that the complainants, Sparhawk and others, have, in my opinion, a clear right to my interposition to protect them in that enjoyment of their dwelling-houses and their pews, to which I have shown they are entitled by law. It

may be that there is a formal error in the joinder of plaintiffs having distinct interests. If there is, it is remediable by amendment. And the very eminent counsel of the defendants, who have argued these cases with signal ability, as well as with fairness, have properly declined to avail themselves of the error, seeking only a decision upon the merits of the controversy. In the case of Sparhawk against the Union Passenger Railway Company, I shall thereupon grant the injunction for which I am moved.

The case of Kenton against the same Company and others, is, if possible, still more clear. He is a stockholder, and, as such, he has a right to insist that the Company shall do nothing *ultra vires*, or contrary to law. Such conduct imperils his interests. He may have purchased his stock with a full knowledge that the Company was acting illegally, but his right is nevertheless to demand that there shall be no continuance in illegality. There is no analogy between the position of this complainant and that of Scott vs. The Atlantic and Great Western Railroad Company, to which my attention has been called. Scott was seeking to destroy the Company of which he claimed to be a shareholder. This plaintiff seeks only to compel his trustees to obey the law, and act within the compass of their powers. He has a clear interest to be protected. The control of a corporation by courts of equity at the instance of a stockholder is a well recognized branch of equity jurisdiction.

That the acts of which this plaintiff complains are

unauthorized and unlawful, is not to be disputed. I have already shown that running cars on Sunday is contrary to law. It exposes the defendants, at least, to the imposition of a penalty. It would be a scandal were I to weigh their possible profit, gained by defiance of law, against the penalties to which they are subjecting themselves. It is also plain that they have no legal authority to carry the mails or to enter into a contract with the United States Government to carry them. If any thing is settled, it is this: that a corporation has no power beyond what is given by its charter. What is not clearly given is denied. These defendants were incorporated as a Passenger Railway Company, to transport passengers, and nothing else. By the law that gave them being they were positively prohibited from permitting freight of any kind to pass over their railway. And, in addition to this, they were expressly subjected to the city ordinances, one of which interdicts the transportation over passenger railways of any other thing than passengers. It was, therefore, beyond their power to contract with the Federal Government to collect and carry the mails, and every step taken in pursuance of such an attempted contract is without right. As well might they have contracted to transport all the cannon and military stores which the Federal Government may have to pass through the city. It appears probable that the defendants sought this contract as a means to enable them to over-ride the State law, but instead of relieving them from the ob-

ligation to cease from their ordinary worldly employment on the Lord's day, it makes their conduct a double violation of law. In this case, therefore, as well as in the other, an injunction will be awarded.

Sparhawk et al. *vs.* The Union Passenger Railway Company of Philadelphia.

Let an injunction issue, to continue until final hearing, restraining the defendants, their officers and servants, from running or permitting to run, any car over any of the streets of the city of Philadelphia, on the railway of the defendants, or otherwise, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, on the complainants giving bond in the sum of $500 with two sureties to be approved of by me, conditioned to indemnify the defendants for all damages they may sustain by reason of this injunction.

Kenton *vs.* the same and others.

Let a similar injunction issue, and also an injunction to restrain the defendants, their officers, conductors and agents from doing any act whatsoever under or by reason of any contract, or alleged contract, entered into by them or any of them for the carrying of the mails, on the complainants giving bond with two sureties in the sum of $500, conditioned to indemnify the defendants for all damages they may sustain by reason of this injunction.